



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2016

No. 24

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 10, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JODY B. HICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

DEDICATED WATER INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress committed to helping the Federal Government do a better job dealing with water and sanitation. We have had great success internationally raising the profile and directing more money in a more effective way to deal with water and sanitation in poor countries, making a difference in millions of lives.

In the United States, we often take those conditions for granted. But as has been demonstrated recently in Flint, Michigan, we do so at our peril because we have serious problems right here in the United States. It is not just Flint, Michigan. There are up to 10 million lead water lines that remain where even a slight change in the water chemistry, even from just repairing it, can damage lead pipes enough to start contaminating people's water. What is underground and out of sight is actually in worse condition than our crumbling roads and bridges. America leaks more water than we drink every day.

In the aftermath of the recession, we have seen States cut drinking water budgets and staff. The Federal Government had cut our investment in drinking water infrastructure by more than 80 percent by 1980. This, despite the fact that ours is a growing country with aging infrastructure that was rated a D by the American Society of Civil Engineers in their latest report.

Now, I am pleased that the administration in its budget would put a little extra money to help replace lead pipes. Sadly, that is being financed by cutting even more from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, essentially at the expense of keeping water clean in the first place.

We should look at our water infrastructure as an entire system and increased Federal investment is long overdue. We would have to increase our funding 500 percent to reach the level of spending during Jimmy Carter's presidency.

I have long advocated the development of a water infrastructure trust fund. We have reintroduced a bipartisan, budget-neutral solution to create a dedicated water infrastructure trust fund to provide additional revenue to State and local water and sanitation projects. It is financed by a voluntary program where businesses that rely heavily on clean water, like the bev-

erage industry, for example, that have a keen interest in maintaining water infrastructure would, on a voluntary basis, pay a miniscule fee. In exchange, they would be designated as supporting the clean water trust fund.

It is estimated that this could generate up to \$7 billion annually in new revenue that could go to State and local governments as grants and loans, which in turn could leverage even more money.

This legislation would also give direction and resources for the EPA to deal with the affordability gap. We can actually finance much of the needed water and infrastructure improvements, but we are hamstrung because there is understandable reluctance to raise rates that fall too much on the poorest of citizens. Thus, we are in a cycle of unpaid water and sewer bills that leaves nobody with satisfactory alternatives.

This legislation would give more money to State and local governments, allowing them to leverage additional money and to focus on ways to deal with a very substantial problem of low income for whom access to safe drinking water and sanitation is every bit as fundamental a human right as what we are doing to help poor people overseas achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I celebrate Secretary Clinton and a number of our colleagues going to Flint, Michigan, to focus on the problem. I applaud people who are looking at where the system failed, but I would hope we would pay as much attention to the systematic failure of Congress and at the State level to attach priority to this fundamental building block for a livable community.

I hope my colleagues will join me, not just in cosponsoring H.R. 4468, but enacting the trust fund and fighting for budgets that represent the resources this crisis demands.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H653

DEDICATED WATER INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, next week marks an important milestone in the history of North Carolina's Piedmont region—the 250th anniversary of the founding of the town of Salem.

In 1752, Moravian Church leaders purchased a 100,000-acre tract in North Carolina from the British Lord Granville. On February 19, 1766, twelve Moravian brethren from nearby settlements made an 8-mile journey to establish the town of Salem, a new community that would serve as the tract's commercial center.

Moravian Church leaders decided that the new town should have the convenience of running water to the buildings. The town built a waterworks, which was constructed by burying hollowed logs from springs located about a mile away. This addition to Salem's infrastructure attracted the attention of President George Washington, who visited in 1793.

However, Washington was not the first famous visitor to Salem. In 1767, the royal Governor William Tryon heard about the building going on in North Carolina's northwest wilderness. He and his wife made the long journey from New Bern to examine the Moravians' new settlement firsthand.

Along with its advanced plumbing, Salem was also at the forefront of innovative medicine and was home to the first university-educated physician in western North Carolina. In addition, Salem was known across the colonial South as a place of commerce and trade, renowned for its pottery, furniture, silver, and other artistic trades.

In 1913, the town of Salem, with its focus on craftsmanship, sustainability, education, and religion merged with the fast-paced industrial town of Winston, thus becoming Winston-Salem.

Today, Winston-Salem is the fifth largest city in North Carolina. It is home to six colleges and universities, including Salem College, the oldest continuously running women's college in the United States, as well as the prestigious Wake Forest University and Winston-Salem State University.

Reaffirming this time-honored tradition of forging boldly ahead, the city continues to build a diverse business space leading in the areas of nanotechnology research, finance, and manufacturing.

The original settlement is a living history museum that engages visitors in an educational, historical experience about those who lived and worked in the early South.

During the yearlong anniversary celebration, the Moravian Church, Old Salem, the City of Winston-Salem, and Forsyth County will honor important milestones in the town's 250-year history, such as George Washington's two-night visit to Salem in 1739 and the Na-

tion's first public July 4th celebration that took place in 1783. Most importantly, the local community will come together to celebrate and reflect on how Salem's past informs its present and shapes its future.

FORTHCOMING LEGISLATION ON PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, Congress will hold its eighth hearing on Puerto Rico later this month. At the direction of Speaker RYAN, the Natural Resources Committee will then lead an effort to craft legislation for the territory. The record will demonstrate that there is not a single crisis in Puerto Rico, but a series of intertwined crises. It is an economic crisis, a fiscal crisis, a liquidity crisis, a debt crisis, an immigration crisis, and a public administration crisis.

If you visualize Puerto Rico as a tree and each crisis as a withering branch, the root of the tree is Puerto Rico's unequal and undignified political status. While the immediate aim is to mend the branches, ultimately, we will need to attack the problem at its root and that means Puerto Rico must become a State or a sovereign nation.

Last week, Antonio Weiss, a senior Treasury Department official, stated as follows:

There is no question that status is vitally important. Why are we proposing that restructuring authorities and the earned income tax credit and fair Medicaid treatment be provided to Puerto Rico? Well, as a territory, Puerto Rico's status does not afford it adequate tools in those three areas. So we believe that we need to afford the Commonwealth those tools that it needs so it can navigate this crisis. And we agree that over a long period of time, status has contributed to this crisis.

Since the problem in Puerto Rico has multiple dimensions, the legislative solution should as well. First, the bill must empower Puerto Rico to restructure a meaningful portion of its debt. The bill could provide a period in which consensual negotiations between bond insurers and their creditors, mediated by neutral experts, can take place. If those negotiations do not bear fruit, the Puerto Rico Government should be empowered to authorize its instrumentalities to adjust their debts under chapter 9 of the Federal Bankruptcy Code, a right that every State has and that Puerto Rico used to have.

Puerto Rico's congressionally approved constitution provides that bonds issued or guaranteed by the central government receive priority payment. What binds us together as Americans—and Puerto Ricans are proud American citizens—is our commitment to the rule of law.

While I do not believe that Congress should override Puerto Rico's constitution, I do expect all creditor classes, including GO bondholders, to make con-

cessions for the public good that will ultimately benefit all stakeholders. I sense that a bipartisan consensus is finally emerging in support of reasonable debt restructuring authority for Puerto Rico.

Second, the bill should address the outrageous disparities that Puerto Rico faces under key Federal programs, a main driver of our deficits and debt. Consider that historically, Puerto Rico received \$300 billion in annual Medicaid funding, while the similarly sized Oregon receives \$5 billion. I challenge any State to run a decent Medicaid program with that insulting sum without overborrowing in the capital markets. Impossible.

Finally, the Puerto Rico Government has a record of fiscal mismanagement. This is a painful fact, but a fact nonetheless. We must face up to it, resolve to do better, and welcome some temporary assistance. I would support the creation of an independent board to approve Puerto Rico Government's financial plan and annual budgets and to help ensure they are adhered to.

The past is not always a prologue. There is no reason why future Puerto Rico leaders cannot embrace fiscal discipline, as distinct from austerity, and rapidly put the oversight board out of business. And Congress should be careful about casting moral judgment on Puerto Rico since the Federal Government has a \$14 trillion debt that is 75 percent of the GDP. We, in Puerto Rico, are responsible for our actions, but Congress is responsible for its actions and inaction as well.

A balanced board will obtain buy-in from government, business, and labor leaders in Puerto Rico and can serve as a bridge to a brighter future. However, a punitive board that disrespects my constituents and tramples on the principle of states' rights will transform me from an ally to an adversary very quickly.

□ 1015

DEBT CEILING BILL IS FINANCIALLY IRRESPONSIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America entrusted Republicans with the House in 2010 and the Senate in 2014.

Democrats lost Congress because their financially irresponsible conduct and trillion-dollar deficits threaten America with a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy.

House Republicans inherited a \$1.3 trillion deficit in 2011. They cut it to \$1.1 trillion in 2012, cut it to \$680 billion in 2013, cut it to \$485 billion in 2014, and cut it to \$439 billion in 2015.

House Republicans did what the American people elected them to do. In each election thereafter, we were entrusted with 2 more years of a House Republican majority.

Unfortunately, newly released data from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reveals America's financial condition has taken a sharp turn for the worse.

According to the CBO, the first quarter fiscal year 2016 deficit deteriorated by \$36 billion compared to 2015's first quarter deficit. If extrapolated to a full year, America's FY 2016 deficit would be \$583 billion. That is \$144 billion worse than in fiscal year 2015.

Out-of-control spending was the problem, not taxes. During the first quarter, tax revenues were up 4 percent, but spending was up even more, at 7 percent.

Now, for the first time since I have been in Congress, Republican compromises and surrenders to Obama and Democrats have made America's deficits worse, not better.

This Congress broke open our kids' piggy banks, stole money we cannot pay back, and used it to pay for a trillion-dollar omnibus spending bill that adds tens of billions of dollars to 2016's deficit. I am proud I voted against the financially irresponsible omnibus.

Mr. Speaker, America's Comptroller General and the CBO repeatedly warn that America's financial path is "unsustainable," meaning America faces a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy unless we get our financial house in order.

Further, the CBO warns that, absent correction, America's debt service costs will increase by \$600 billion per year within a decade, roughly what America spends on national defense, which begs the question: Where will the money come from for an additional annual \$600 billion debt service payment?

America's total debt approached \$14 trillion when I was elected to Congress in 2010. We have blown through the \$19 trillion mark. Now the CBO projects America will blow through the \$29 trillion debt mark in a decade.

For emphasis, Washington is engaged in the worst generational theft in American history. Washington steals from our children and grandchildren with a callous devil-may-care attitude so that we can today live high on the hog, even though it forces our children into hardship and poverty.

Economic principles don't care if you are a family, a business, or a country. If you borrow more money than you can pay back, you go bankrupt. Time is running out. Washington must balance the budget before America's debt burden spirals out of control, before it is too late to prevent the debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that awaits us.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are rightfully angry at Washington elected officials who care more about special interest campaign contributions than American voters or America's future.

Will the American people channel their anger in the 2016 elections and elect Washington officials who both understand the threat posed by deficits

and debt and have the backbone to fix it? The answer to that question determines whether America continues as a great nation and world power or declines into the dustbin of history.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for anyone else, but as for me, Mo Brooks from Alabama's Fifth Congressional District, I fight for financial responsibility and prosperity and against an American bankruptcy and economic depression.

EMERGENCY REQUEST FOR \$1.8 BILLION TO FIGHT ZIKA VIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's emergency request of \$1.8 billion to fight the spread of the Zika virus, a dangerous, mosquito-borne illness that has surfaced in my home State of Hawaii and in at least 12 other States across the country.

The symptoms and effects of the Zika virus, which have prompted an international public health emergency from the World Health Organization, are not dissimilar to another mosquito-borne disease, Dengue fever.

Dengue fever is spread through the very same *Aedes aegypti* mosquito as carries the Zika virus, as well as other mosquito variations. Like the Zika virus, Dengue fever symptoms include fevers, rashes, joint and muscle pains, severe headaches, and other painful symptoms.

The CDC has reported the harmful symptoms and effects of both Zika and Dengue and the ability of both of these diseases to spread very rapidly through mosquitos present in many regions of the United States, including in my home district.

So far, there have been around 50 cases of Zika virus confirmed in the United States. But in the past 16 weeks, there have been 252 known cases of Dengue fever on Hawaii Island alone.

Now, Mayor Billy Kenoi, Hawaii County's mayor, on Monday announced a state of emergency for the county to deploy more resources to battle this Dengue fever outbreak.

I have asked our Governor to declare a state of emergency in response to this outbreak so that the people of Hawaii can receive every resource available to protect themselves, to eradicate this mosquito and its breeding grounds, and stop the spread of Dengue fever, which has quickly become the largest outbreak in the State of Hawaii since the 1940s.

The CDC has activated its emergency operations center to level 1 status. Now, to put this level 1 status in context, the CDC has only raised the emergency operations center to level 1 three times in the past: during the Ebola outbreak in 2014, during the H1N1 pandemic in 2009, and after Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

The President's leadership and emergency request on this urgent issue is warranted and necessary to respond aggressively to the Zika virus early on. He is treating this with the seriousness it deserves, recognizing this global public health threat, the impacts, and long-lasting effects of which still are not fully known.

At the end of last year, Congress came together and passed a bipartisan omnibus spending bill that increased funding for public health preparedness and response by more than \$52 million than the previous fiscal year, but this additional emergency funding request is necessary now in communities like mine on Hawaii Island and in different parts of the country to combat disease-transmitting mosquito viruses like Zika and Dengue fever.

It is imperative that Congress, Federal agencies, local governments, and private sector partners partner together to take action now to deal with the outbreaks we already have and prevent something far worse from occurring.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to push this critical public health funding forward.

PFC JOSEPH P. DWYER VETERANS PEER SUPPORT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced legislation in the House to expand the PFC Joseph P. Dwyer Veterans Peer Support Program to the national level.

PFC Joseph Dwyer was from Mount Sinai, New York, located in my home district of Suffolk County.

PFC Dwyer served in Iraq and received nationwide recognition for a photograph that went viral, showing him cradling a wounded Iraqi boy while his unit was fighting its way up to the capital city of Baghdad.

Sadly, after returning home and struggling with PTSD, PFC Dwyer died in 2008 and left behind a young widow, Matina, and a 2-year-old daughter, Meagan.

In 2012, while serving in the New York State Senate, I created the Dwyer Program as part of the 2012-2013 State budget. Originally in four counties, including Suffolk, this program has since expanded to over a dozen counties throughout New York.

The Dwyer Program is a peer-to-peer support program for veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury. The program provides a safe, confidential, and educational platform where all veterans are welcome to build vet-to-vet relationships, supporting each other's transition from service to post-service life.

During the first year alone, we were able to conduct 148 group sessions, serving 450 veterans just within Suffolk. Since 2013, the program has

helped over 1,500 veterans in New York State battling PTSD and TBI.

With the success that we have had in New York, I know that, if we make this program national, we will ensure that every veteran across America will eventually have access to a peer-to-peer support group.

With the VA reporting that an estimated 22 veterans a day commit suicide, this national effort is long overdue. We must ensure that all veterans across America receive the proper care they need and deserve.

I will be working hard to spread awareness of my bill, gather cosponsors and the support of veteran groups and mental health organizations from all across the country so that we can pass this bill as soon as possible.

WE MUST ACT NOW ON THE ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, shifting gears, on a completely separate topic, I also rise today to discuss the mosquito-borne Zika virus, which has spread at rapid rates across South America, Central America, and the Caribbean, infecting individuals in more than 25 countries.

Zika has caused widespread alarm across the global community after Brazil reported a rise in the reported cases of microcephaly, a disease that leads tragically to a baby being born with an unusually small head and brain damage.

What is so concerning about the Zika virus is how easily it can spread. The virus is spread not only through a mosquito bite, but also by contact with infected blood or sexual contact.

Furthermore, there is currently no vaccine to prevent or any medicine to treat the virus. All these factors have led the World Health Organization to declare the Zika virus a public health emergency.

Confirmed cases of the Zika virus have been popping up across the U.S., including at least three confirmed cases in my home district of Suffolk County, Long Island.

With the recent outbreaks and the number of Zika cases among travelers visiting or returning to the United States, it is only a matter of time before this becomes a widespread epidemic right here at home. This is why we must act now.

I recently introduced legislation, the Counterterrorism Screening and Assistance Act of 2016, H.R. 4314, which passed the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with bipartisan support.

One key aspect of this legislation is that the bill would put in place a monitoring system that would screen for infectious diseases abroad to contain and prevent any potential outbreaks.

The bill also helps quarantine the virus, authorizing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide equipment and supplies to mitigate the risk or threat of infectious diseases such as Zika.

This is a measure that is long overdue to protect not only our homeland from terrorism, but also to ensure that

we are prepared to combat the spread of any infectious diseases. With this bill's passage out of committee, it is clear that my colleagues in Congress share my view.

I will continue to push for full passage of my Counterterrorism Screening and Assistance Act in the House and urge my colleagues to bring this bipartisan bill to the House floor for a vote.

COMBATING BDS ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement, more commonly known as the BDS movement, has been employed as a hateful weapon to delegitimize the State of Israel and all those who stand with her.

The BDS movement has neither brought Israelis and Palestinians closer to peace nor advanced the laudable goal of improving dialogue between the supporters of both sides. Instead, it has served as a means to demagogue Israel and inflame tensions in communities and college campuses around our Nation.

Rather than sit back and react to the BDS movement's aggressive efforts to foment hatred for Israel, it is time to take charge and simply say: "Enough." It is time to go on offense against the BDS movement's ongoing economic warfare targeting Israel.

That is why I am proud to announce the Combating BDS Act of 2016, bipartisan legislation that I am introducing with the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS), a courageous leader in the anti-BDS movement.

The Combating BDS Act of 2016 affirms on the Federal level the authority of State and local governments to divest public funds or entities that engage in commerce or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel.

Here is why this idea is so important. Similar to previous local efforts to divest from companies doing business with Iran, we are now seeing a growing movement in State and local governments throughout the Nation to enact measures to divest public funds from entities participating in anti-Israel BDS.

□ 1030

The Combating BDS Act of 2016 strengthens these efforts by affirming the legal authority of State and local governments to act on divestment without running afoul of any potential Federal limitations.

This important legislation empowers community leaders and individuals who seek to counter the hateful targeting and delegitimization against Israel, and it sends an unquestionable message about where the United States Congress stands on BDS.

This is not about left versus right. This is about right versus wrong. It

must remain bipartisan. As the author of the Combating BDS Act of 2016, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this powerful and important legislation.

IRAN'S HOSTILITY MUST BE COMBATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Islamic Republic of Iran—its past and its future.

February 11 is just an ordinary day for Americans, but in Iran, tomorrow is anything but ordinary. Military parades and massive state-sponsored celebrations fill the streets of Tehran and cities across the Islamic Republic. In just a few hours, it will be Islamic Revolution's Victory Day in Iran. The regime celebrates 37 years since the violent coup that brought the Ayatollah Khomeini to power and transferred Iran into a fundamentalist Islamic theocracy and the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

It is a dark period of history, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of innocent people were killed as the revolutionaries consolidated power. The U.S. Embassy was overrun and more than 50 Americans were held hostage for 444 days.

The United States has seen six Presidents since 1979, reflecting a broad range of leadership styles and governing philosophies. The Islamic Republic has been led by two Supreme Leaders, both zealots fanatically committed to the revolutionary ideas they espouse being celebrated on the streets of Tehran on this day. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the same Iran today as we were in 1979.

The only day being celebrated by some Americans at the moment is implementation day, as President Obama's dangerous nuclear deal has now come and gone. The world is much more dangerous because of it.

Iran, the leading patron of global terrorism, just received a \$100 billion check. The mullahs continue to foment violence and chaos across the Middle East, and their nuclear structure remains intact. The Obama administration has long argued that we would only be giving them \$50 billion, but even they have conceded that it is closer to \$100 billion or more.

We were also told that Iran would moderate its behavior as a result of this capitulation. Just in the past few weeks, Iran captured and humiliated American sailors, illegally launched ballistic missiles, fired rockets within 1,500 yards of U.S. ships, and flew a drone over a U.S. aircraft carrier. The list goes on and on.

Iranian Special Forces continue to assist al-Assad in his slaughter of innocents in Syria. Over 200,000 have been killed so far. Iranian-backed militias are likely responsible for kidnapping three American contractors in Iraq.

It doesn't take much imagination to figure out what Iran will do with another \$100 billion, which is the windfall that they are about to receive based on this bad deal. As President Obama and Secretary Kerry have both begrudgingly admitted, it is nearly certain that the Iranians will use this money to sow the seeds of even more death and destruction. Think about that. They are nearly certain that part of this \$100 billion will go there.

The Islamic Republic is not our friend, Mr. Speaker. It is a dangerous geopolitical foe. It is led by a cult of extremists that are hellbent on our annihilation. Yet President Obama will do nothing to stem the tide of the Ayatollah's ambitions.

When faced with an adversary whose theology and eschatology are fundamentally incompatible with peace and world order, the United States, under President Obama's leadership, chose a path of appeasement. I truly believe President Obama has made perhaps the most dangerous foreign policy blunder in our lifetime. We are now facing a newly emboldened, cash-rich, radical Islamic regime fully committed to weakening our Nation, terrorizing the West, and destroying our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to Congress to do everything in our power to keep as much of this money as possible out of the hands of Iran's terrorist proxies. The Congress must move swiftly to strengthen terrorism- and human rights-related sanctions against Iran and its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. The Congress must maintain strict oversight over Iran's nuclear program as its infrastructure remains intact.

Iran's hostility must be combated, Mr. Speaker, and this body should not abrogate that responsibility, even if our President already has.

SARACINI AVIATION SAFETY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent reports of ISIS entering Europe disguised as refugees and a terrorist having just tried to take down an aircraft, I think it is important to understand the threats we face, but also to learn from the past.

In the 9/11 Report, al Qaeda mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed told al Qaeda terrorists to watch the cockpit doors at takeoff and landing to observe whether the captain went into the lavatory during the flight and to note whether the flight attendants brought food into the cockpit.

We all know what happened when these attackers stormed the flight deck and turned our airliners into weapons of war. But today, more than 14 years after the attacks of September 11, the FAA still admits the cockpit is vulnerable when the reinforced door has to be opened. That is unacceptable.

We know that terrorists study our vulnerabilities and make their plans accordingly. Yet, even after the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission emphasized the importance of "a layered security system," we have not taken the simple, cost-effective step to protect the skies above us with the installation of secondary barrier doors.

These lightweight, wire-mesh gates can be closed whenever the cockpit door is opened and effectively protect against a terrorist—or team of terrorists—rushing the cockpit by providing the pilot enough time to recognize the threat and reenter and lock the reinforced cockpit door. They are easy to deploy and stow, and provide the "layered protection" that experts agree is needed.

That is why I have introduced the Saracini Aviation Safety Act. This is a one-page bill named after my constituent, United Airlines pilot Victor J. Saracini, whose life was taken when his aircraft was hijacked and flown into the South Tower of the World Trade Center on September 11. It requires that these cost-effective secondary barriers be included on large passenger aircraft.

We promised to never forget those lost on 9/11 and the lessons learned by all of us on that tragic day; yet after many years and more than 40 hijacking attempts around the world, including five that were successful, we are still not taking this threat seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to advocate for the adoption of this common-sense policy, both as a stand-alone bill or as part of a larger piece of legislation like the FAA reauthorization, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

GTMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most oft-repeated campaign promises from President Obama's 2008 campaign was his determination to close the U.S. Guantanamo Bay detention facility.

Congress, a coequal branch of government representing each citizen and re-elected every 2 years, hasn't come to the same conclusion as President Obama about the status of GTMO moving forward. Because of this, we have blocked funding for its closure year after year after year.

We have strong reasons for concern. Last September, the Director of National Intelligence reported that 117 transferred detainees are confirmed to be reengaging in terrorist activities, with another 79 suspected to have done so. Disturbingly, this amounts to a full 30 percent of transferred detainees either confirmed or suspected of reengaging in terrorist activities.

The Director's report clearly shows that the detainee transfer process is obviously deeply flawed and poses a significant unnecessary and unaccept-

able risk to the security of our Nation and, quite frankly, the world.

The high percentage of reengagement clearly exposes the fact that we have just simply failed to properly identify the threat posed by transferred detainees and provide necessary safeguards to protect our citizens—safeguards that should have been in place before one single transfer ever took place.

Given the dire national security implications posed by these detainee transfers, I, along with 23 of my colleagues in this House, sent a letter last week to President Obama requesting to see the terms of agreements made with countries where detainees have and will be transferred.

There are 55 countries, by the way, including the likes of Yemen, Somalia, Pakistan, Libya, Iraq, and Iran. Yemen, really? Libya is a failed state—which we may have had a great part in creating—and we are sending terrorists there to be detained? Think about it. What incentive would it take for you to bring a terrorist to your country? To your neighborhood? To your home?

In particular, I am interested in the agreements' provisions to mitigate the inherent danger posed by detainee transfers. Specifically, what were the provisions aimed at preventing reengagement? Were there any? How did we ensure accountability by the home countries? What did these nations do to prevent contact with known terrorists, especially in countries that are full of terrorists, like Yemen or Somalia? How did we ensure these countries offer no form of aid and assistance to terrorist organizations?

The President says detaining these people is a recruiting magnet. Well, I wonder if we shouldn't detain gang members in our country. It is a right of passage to go to prison if you are in a gang. Should we let them all out, too? According to that logic, incarcerating them creates more of them.

He also says that detaining them indefinitely, without a trial, violates America's principles. You know what? He is right. You ought to ask yourselves as taxpayers: Why did we pay millions of dollars for a state-of-the-art court facility for sensitive and top-secret information during a trial, and yet no one has been put on trial? It is right there next to the detention facility. I walked through it myself. Why can't the military tribunals take place so we can find out what the deal is with these people and have them incarcerated correctly or set them free? It doesn't happen at all.

President Obama declared to America in 2013 that his administration is "the most transparent administration in history." I will take some issue with that. Despite that fact, the President has clearly not lived up to this standard recently.

I sincerely hope that the President will give his promise of transparency higher priority than the priority given to unilaterally closing GTMO as part of a final-year, legacy-driven agenda. It is

not about his agenda. It is about the security of our Nation. It should be about the security of the world. These folks should not be let out. They should be given due process. They certainly shouldn't be sent to countries that are terrorist in nature.

Finally, the American people should know what the deal is. How much is this costing? Are we sending arms to these countries? What are the arrangements? There are 55 countries. Why would they take these terrorists?

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL BOY SCOUTS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, February 8, is recognized by many as National Boy Scouts Day, marking the incorporation of the Boy Scouts of America 106 years ago.

I have spent close to four decades as a scoutmaster, Juniata Valley Boy Scout Council executive board member and council president, and as a scouting dad. My wife and I are scouting parents, with three sons we are very proud of who are Eagle Scouts today.

In my own scouting experience, I was honored to become one of just 2,000 people, since 1969, to receive the national Distinguished Eagle Scout Award.

It was my experience in scouting that first sparked my interest in public service—in the vein of the Boy Scout promise, which urges us, in part, to do our duty to God, to our country, and in the service of other people.

Scouting got its start around the turn of the last century, thanks to the efforts of British Army Officer Robert Stephenson Smyth Baden-Powell.

As Scouting history has it, in 1909, a Chicago businessman, a publisher, William D. Boyce, who actually grew up in western Pennsylvania, lost his way in a dense fog in London.

□ 1045

A young boy came to his aid, guiding Mr. Boyce to his destination. And in the end, when Mr. Boyce offered that young boy a tip, a coin, the boy refused the tip offered by Mr. Boyce stating: Sir, I am a Scout, and Scouts do not take rewards for doing good turns.

Well, that young boy was a Scout. We don't know his identity today, but he certainly has changed our country. That single act of volunteerism gave birth to what became the Boy Scouts of America, incorporated in 1910.

In 2013, there were more than 2.6 million members of the Boy Scouts of America. The program today serves not just boys, but also girls in our Scouting Venturing program.

In a time which has, in many ways, been highlighted by a decline of volunteerism and criticism of perhaps our younger newest generations, I know

that our Nation's future is in good hands with those who live and dedicate themselves to the Scout Oath or the Scout Promise, which they state at the beginning of every meeting and they end with. The words since that time are:

“On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout Law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.”

Scouting prepares youth to be productive and successful members of the workforce. The program introduces our youth to countless career opportunities, including the STEM fields.

As a Scout Master for almost three decades, I have seen these 11-year-old youths, until the time they become 18 and go on into life, the career paths they were exposed to for the first time—whether it was medicine, or teaching, or professional fire fighting, or across the board—through the Scouting experience. What employer would not benefit from an employee with practical exposure from an organization that emphasizes values, service, and leadership?

Scouting fosters the values that make communities strong and preferred for families to set down roots and to contribute.

Scouting offers the world's finest leadership training for adults and youth, leadership training that can be generalized to any occupations, including the United States House of Representatives.

As frequently said, “Scouting is out- ing.” Scouting is the youth leadership program that is grounded, not just in values, but in the beauty and the nature of the outdoors, building appreciation and respect for God's creation and for active lives, for being physically active, that is so desperately needed today.

Now it is my hope that this wonderful organization continues to contribute to the lives of young men and young ladies for generations to come.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG EPIDEMIC IN WEST VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, every morning, countless West Virginians wake up fearing that they lost a loved one to drugs the night before; and every morning, far too many West Virginians find this fear has come true.

The prescription drug abuse epidemic in our State is a tragedy that we cannot afford to ignore. It ravages our communities, rips families apart, stunts the development of our youth, and further ruptures our State's already ailing economy.

Overuse of prescription pain medication is one of the leading causes of

opioid addiction. When a patient has more narcotic pain medication than they need after a medical event, this excess medication can fall into the wrong hands; and a narcotic pain medication in the wrong hands often leads to addiction. In fact, the National Institute on Drug Abuse has found that 1 in 15 people who take nonmedical prescription pain relievers will try heroin.

Last year, the number of fatal overdoses from prescription painkillers increased by 16 percent and, from heroin, 28 percent in the United States. In West Virginia, the story is even worse. According to a recent study by the Trust for America's Health, the Mountain State has the highest rate of overdose deaths in the entire United States.

This issue is above party politics. It is a plague that all Americans must come together to solve. That is why, yesterday, I introduced H.R. 4499, the Promoting Responsible Opioid Prescribing Act. This bipartisan bill strikes a harmful provision of ObamaCare that places unnecessary pressure on doctors and hospitals to prescribe narcotic pain medicine.

This concern was brought to my attention while meeting with doctors and other healthcare professional workers in Charleston, West Virginia, who are active in our State's medical society. In other words, this was their idea. I thank them for bringing this to my attention, and I encourage others to bring any ideas to help fight back against the opium epidemic to your local Congressman.

In 2006, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, and the Department of Health and Human Services developed a survey called the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems, pronounced “H-caps,” for short. HCAHPS is a standardized survey used to measure patient perspectives and satisfaction on the care they receive in hospital settings.

At first, hospitals used this survey on an optional basis. However, when ObamaCare became law in 2010, it put in place “pay for performance” provisions that use these survey results as a factor in calculating Medicare reimbursement rates for physicians and hospitals on quality measures.

This provision of ObamaCare was intended to save money and to force improvements on hospital performance. However, it has led to unintended consequences in the area of pain management.

The HCAHPS survey contains three questions on pain management:

One, during this hospital stay, did you need medicine for pain?

Two, during this hospital stay, how often was your pain well-controlled?

Three, during this hospital stay, how often did the hospital staff do everything they could to help you with your pain?

Because of the tie to reimbursement, hospitals and physicians are pressured

to perform well under HCAHPS, including the pain management questions. However, doctors, not the Federal Government, know how best to treat patients, and that includes the question of how best to use narcotic pain medication.

The PROP Act would remove these pain management questions from consideration when CMS is conducting reimbursement analysis. However, the patient would still answer the survey questions so that hospitals can monitor patient satisfaction.

By severing the relationship between HCAHPS questions on pain management and reimbursement, doctors would no longer feel the undue pressure to overprescribe opioid narcotics to people they believe may be abusing it. This simple change will help reduce access to narcotic pain medication for patients who do not need it, thereby reducing the risk of addiction.

I would like to take the time to thank the bipartisan cosponsors of this bill: ANNIE KUSTER, Chairman HAL ROGERS, STEPHEN LYNCH, FRANK GUINTA, TIM RYAN, and BARBARA COMSTOCK.

Our bill has been endorsed by the American Medical Association and the American Society of Addiction Medicine.

I encourage my colleagues in the House to consider cosponsoring my bill, H.R. 4499, the PROP Act.

DISAPPEARANCE OF DAVID SNEDDON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, 2004, David Sneddon, a student at Brigham Young University, disappeared without explanation while hiking in the Yunnan province of southwest China.

David is an outstanding young man who speaks fluent Korean and had spent the summer studying Mandarin in Beijing, with plans to return to the U.S. in August to finish his degree in Chinese. He had already paid a housing deposit and registered to take the Law School Admission Test.

The U.S. State Department and the Chinese Government eventually concluded that David fell into a gorge while hiking, but David's family conducted their own exhaustive investigation, with David's father and two older brothers flying to China shortly after his disappearance to retrace his steps.

In the course of talking with numerous eyewitnesses, David's family discovered facts which contradict the official explanation and which, I believe, are compelling evidence of another possibility, which I will get to in just a moment.

My staff and I met David's family and heard his story soon after I was elected 3 years ago. The Sneddon's are remarkable people of great faith who have continued to pursue an expla-

nation for David's disappearance for the past 11 years.

The resolution I am introducing today regarding David's disappearance is a result of the hard work and diligence of David's parents, siblings, and cousins. They deserve answers. They deserve to have their government do everything possible to determine what happened to David.

I should also add that David's story is personal to me. He was a close friend of my oldest son, Sean. In fact, following David's 2-year missionary service in South Korea, David taught my son Sean the Korean language as he was preparing to begin his own missionary service in South Korea. Though I have not met David, I am grateful for the impact he had on Sean's life.

Over the past 3 years, I have had various opportunities to meet with State Department personnel to discuss David's disappearance. They are good people, and I commend them for their help, particularly in the immediate aftermath of his disappearance when they repeatedly pressured the Chinese Government to pursue the various leads identified by David's family.

However, I am concerned that bureaucratic inertia has made the State Department complacent in this case. I am concerned the State Department leadership has not done all they can do to pursue all of the possible explanations for his disappearance.

One of the unexplored possibilities is that David was abducted by agents of the North Korean regime, something which a number of respected experts on North Korea have advanced in recent years. While this may sound like an outlandish theory to those unfamiliar with North Korea's history, it is becoming very plausible when you understand the regime's long history of abducting foreign citizens to use in training their own foreign agents.

For many years, North Korea systematically kidnapped Japanese citizens and used captives to train their intelligence operatives in Japanese language and culture. The regime finally admitted to the abductions in 2002 and returned five of the Japanese citizens.

There are numerous other facts which, when combined, make North Korea's involvement conceivable.

North Korean agents are known to operate in Yunnan Province, a common area for those escaping North Korea into Southeast Asia.

David disappeared during a long time of heightened tensions between the U.S. and North Korea, just weeks after this House passed the North Korean Human Rights Act.

And David disappeared 1 month after North Korea released Charles Jenkins, an American deserter from the Korean war being held and used precisely as the abducted Japanese citizens: as a language teacher for North Korean military cadets and spies. Jenkins was the last of the known Americans being

held for this purpose, and it is possible the regime needed a replacement for him.

Just this past Sunday, North Korea's rocket launch, in defiance of sanctions and against explicit counsel of the international community, reminded us that North Korea doesn't operate on the same norms that guide diplomacy for most of the rest of the world. They are a criminal enterprise more than a government, and they can do nothing for their own people, let alone for other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I don't raise the possibility regarding David Sneddon's disappearance lightly, and I didn't sponsor this resolution lightly. I recognize the words we speak on foreign policy have consequences far beyond this room. But David is the only American to disappear in China without explanation since the normalization of relations during the Nixon administration.

This is not a fact to be taken lightly. My resolution lays out the facts of his disappearance and asks three essential actions by the State Department and intelligence community:

First, that they continue to investigate and consider all possible explanations for David's disappearance, including potential abduction by North Korea;

Second, that they coordinate their efforts with the Governments of Japan, South Korea, and particularly China, the country known to have at least some influence over North Korea;

And finally, that they keep the Congress and the Sneddon family informed of these efforts.

I would like to thank Senator LEE for sponsoring the companion bill in the Senate, and the rest of the Utah delegation for joining me as cosponsors. I think I can speak for the delegation when I say that David's family deserves a thorough effort from their own government to discover what happened to him. This is the very least that we can ask.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God of mercy, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly as results from another primary election reverberate through our political landscape. Give them wisdom and charity, that they might work together, with needed focus, for the common good.

As the candidates now move on to other contests, may all Americans hear the call to responsible citizenship, learning the substance of candidates' positions and plans for the future of our Nation. May we all do our homework so that our experiment in representative democracy might flourish and all would take pride in the government to be constructed from our votes.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OUR BORDER IS NOT SECURE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, new reports from the Department of Homeland Security show a surge in illegal immigration, 30 percent, actually. Last Friday I returned to McAllen, Texas, to tour the Rio Grande River by boat and see our security challenges firsthand, something President Obama has refused to do.

Let me be clear. Our border is not secure. Obama's amnesty is devastating for Texas, particularly its border cities, but the problems far exceed our border. This affects the whole country. It undermines the safety of all Americans and hurts law-abiding taxpayers.

My most sacred duty is to protect our homeland and every citizen in it. I spent 29 years as a fighter pilot and 7 as a POW doing just that. Rest assured, I will continue to fight to keep America safe.

GUN VIOLENCE MYTHS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday 5 people were killed and 25 injured in four mass shootings in New York, Florida, Illinois, and Mississippi. Yet, Congress has done nothing to reduce gun violence in America.

While this is happening, opponents to commonsense, responsible gun safety legislation are spreading misinformation and sharing myths, myths such as: criminals don't exploit loopholes to buy guns; there is no gun show loophole; the assault weapons ban that was previously in place didn't work; and strong gun laws don't reduce gun crimes.

It is time that we start calling out these myths and correcting the record with the facts. In the coming days, I will be doing just that on my Web site and through social media to help build support for commonsense, responsible gun safety legislation.

After all, Mr. Speaker, facts should guide us in doing our work and doing all that we can to reduce gun violence in America.

HONORING PASTOR MICHAEL MOORE

(Mr. DENHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Pastor Michael Moore for his many years of service to the Manteca community. After 29 years at Crossroads Grace Community Church, Pastor Mike is retiring from his role as senior leader.

Almost 50 years ago, Pastor Mike married the love of his life, Grace, and together they started a church where everyone could feel welcome.

In 1987, Crossroads Grace Community began with a Bible study group led by Pastor Mike made up of 17 members. The church grew to encompass Pastor Mike's and Grace's vision of a casual atmosphere, practical and relevant teachings, with contemporary worship.

Pastor Mike led the congregation in working with local churches to establish the Hope Family Shelter and provide housing to homeless families. The church also established a mobile medical clinic to provide free medical service for those in need and has sent teams to respond to global disasters such as Hurricane Katrina, the tsunami in Asia, and the Oklahoma tornadoes. The church has also sent missionaries to many corners of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Pastor Michael Moore and his unwavering leadership in our community and many accomplishments around the globe.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Spanish Fork, Utah, January 16, 2014:

Marie King, 55 years old.

Kelly Boren, 32.

Joshua Boren, 7 years old.

Haley Boren, 5.

Holly Hill, South Carolina, July 15, 2015:

Jerome Butler, 50 years old.

Krystal Hutto, 28 years old.

Shamekia Sanders, 17.

Tamara Perry, 14.

Saco, Maine, July 26, 2014:

Heather Smith, 35.

Jason Montez, 12 years old.

Noah Montez, 7.

Lily Smith, 4 years old.

Culpeper, Virginia, August 3, 2014:

Shauna Washington, 35 years old.

Onesha Washington, 13.

Onya Washington, 6.

Olivia Washington, 4.

Callison, South Carolina, October 29, 2013:

Richard Fields, 51 years old.

Melissa Fields, 49.

Chandra Fields, 26.

William Robinson, 9 years old.

Tariq Robinson, 9 years old.

BLUE RIBBON STUDY PANEL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week I was grateful to chair the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing to receive outside views on biodefense for the Department of Defense and review the bipartisan report of the Blue Ribbon Study Panel on Biodefense.

Chaired by former Senator Joe Lieberman and former Governor and Secretary of Homeland Security Tom Ridge, the panel evaluated the status of prevention, deterrence, preparedness, detection, response, attribution, recovery, and mitigation of our Nation's biodefense.

The report was clear. Our Nation faces a complex threat from both biological weapons and naturally occurring diseases. For example, the recent response to the Ebola outbreak demonstrates the importance of the Department of Defense's biodefense contributions to broader government and global efforts.

I am grateful that the former Attorney General Ken Wainstein and Dr. Gerald Parker, both members of the panel, were there testifying before the subcommittee. I look forward to working with the Department of Defense to implement the findings and recommendations.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

PEOPLE OF FLINT, MICHIGAN, ARE STRONG

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my hometown is Flint, Michigan. When we leave here at the end of every week, I fly home to Flint. This is a very proud community. It is the birthplace of General Motors. It is where the UAW workers sat down in 1936 to get the first UAW contract to help build the middle class.

The last few decades have been tough for my community. We have taken a lot of hits, a lot of poverty, high unemployment, but we have always been able to get back up again as a community because there are strong people in Flint, Michigan.

What has happened now in Flint is because of careless actions by State officials who put dollars and cents ahead of the health of people, ahead of the health of 9,000 children.

We can get back up again in Flint, but we need a State response far more robust than what has been recommended by Michigan's Governor and we need help from the Federal Government. These people are American citizens.

If the State won't act to make it right for the people of Flint, we need our Federal Government to do everything in its power to help these people and help Flint get back up again.

HAMILTON CITY, CALIFORNIA, LEVEE PROTECTION

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it is budget season in Washington, D.C., and one of the things that should be in the budget is infrastructure. I am glad to hear that the President has included \$8.5 million in funding to replace the badly degraded levees on the Sacramento River near Hamilton City, California.

Flood danger has forced evacuation of Hamilton City six times since 1980. The existing levee project provides only 10-year flood event protection when the standard really should be 200-year flood event protection.

Working with local residents who have contributed their own money and resources to the project, we secured over \$12 million in Federal funding so far.

Mr. Speaker, this year's additional funding will allow major progress on a project that will protect the homes and families of over 200 north State residents, finally giving Hamilton City some peace of mind.

AUTOMATED COLLECTION OF USER FEES AT THE PEACE BRIDGE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the budget that President Obama sent to Congress yesterday contained a number of important proposals: more cancer research funding, more treatment for prescription painkiller and heroin addiction, and making permanent the solar investment tax credit and the new market tax credit.

While these initiatives generated headlines, one small and simple provision could have a significant impact on the economy of western New York.

Beginning this year, at the Peace Bridge in Buffalo, Customs and Border Protection will automate the collection of user fees for commercial vehicles. Currently fees are collected manually, which increases congestion and deters Canadians from traveling to western New York.

I called for the implementation of this policy last year and am happy to see the Department of Homeland Security moved so quickly on it. By automating fee collection, hiring more Customs and Border Protection officers, this budget will benefit the western New York economy that is dependent on commerce via the Peace Bridge.

CONGENITAL HEART FUTURES REAUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as February is recognized as Heart Month, I rise on behalf of the nearly 40,000 babies born each year with congenital heart defects, CHD. CHD is the most common birth defect and the number one cause of birth defect-related deaths.

A few decades ago babies born with CHD were not living into adulthood. Now, due to continued investment and research and a series of medical breakthroughs, 90 percent of babies born with CHD are living into adulthood. Let's make it 100 percent.

There is still work to be done, and we must ensure these efforts to improve the lives of those with CHD continue. This is why I introduced the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act, to spend CHD research, raise awareness of the importance of specialized care, and ensure important research continues.

We must advance this legislation for the millions of Americans who need our help.

□ 1215

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the success of the Affordable Care Act.

The numbers are in and, once again, millions of Americans signed up for quality affordable health coverage. More than 12.7 million Americans selected plans through the health insurance marketplaces—4 million, or 42 percent, of whom were new customers this year.

People want coverage. And, thanks to the ACA, millions can now have the security of knowing they won't go bankrupt if they get sick or have an accident, can't be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition, and have access to preventative and primary care services at little to no out-of-pocket cost.

In the 29th District that I am proud to represent, 55,000 residents fall into the expansion gap and have no insurance because States haven't expanded Medicaid. It is time for Texas and other States to do the right thing and recognize that health care is essential for some of our poorest families by expanding Medicaid.

The Affordable Care Act is here to stay. I hope Congress will move past repeal attempts and start talking about how we can make the Affordable Care Act work even better for the American people. I stand ready to work with my colleagues on this critical issue.

IT IS TIME TO RELEASE ZHU YUFU ONCE AND FOR ALL

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today yet again in need of bringing the world's attention to the plight of Zhu Yufu.

Four years ago today, this democracy advocate was unjustly sentenced by the Chinese Government to 7 years behind bars, following previous imprisonments. His tireless advocacy for democratic rights, freedom of speech, and the rule of law is worthy of praise. Yet the Chinese Government has harassed and jailed him numerous times on faulty charges.

Yufu is in poor health. He is not able to stand without support. He has coronary heart disease and a coronary artery tumor, in addition to other ailments. Yet Chinese authorities refuse to provide him with medical care or medication. Further, they have forced him to do hard labor and have caused the job losses of his family members.

This Saturday, Zhu Yufu turns 63 years old. The least the Chinese Government can do is provide him with proper medical treatment, improve his living conditions, and leave his family alone. If China is serious about demonstrating any legitimate leadership, it should release him and the hundreds of others like him immediately.

MURDERED FOR THEIR FAITH

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 year since three young Americans were killed, I believe, for their faith. I think the evidence supports that.

On February 10, 2015, Deah Barakat, Yusor Abu-Salha, and Razan Abu-Salha were murdered in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. They were shot and killed because of their faith. They were Muslim.

Yusor was a graduate of North Carolina State University, and planned on enrolling at UNC Chapel Hill School of Dentistry, where her husband, Deah, was studying to become a dentist. Razan, Yusor's sister, was a student at NCSU as well. She was only 19.

These murders are heartbreaking. They should be heartbreaking to every American. They show us the stark reality that bigotry is alive and well and that good people have to stand against it. Hate speech and scapegoating have real life consequences.

Children are bullied in school, houses of worship are vandalized, and people are killed for the way they dress or how they pray. This should end now.

HONORING VERNITA TODD, CEO OF HEART CITY HEALTH CENTER

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a champion of public health in my district as she moves to California to continue her work serving the public.

As chief executive officer of Heart City Health Center in Elkhart, Indiana, Vernita Todd has tirelessly advocated on behalf of others. Over the last 10 years, she has led the Center in achieving its mission of contributing to the health of our community by providing access to high-quality and accessible health care.

Vernita has received national recognition for her role in prioritizing advocacy as a crucial component to Heart City Health Center's mission. Whether at the city, State, or Federal level, the impact of her work can surely be felt by thousands.

On behalf of the people of Indiana's Second Congressional District, I thank Vernita Todd for her contributions to improving thousands of lives throughout the northern Indiana community and the country as a whole. I wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 10, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 10, 2016 at 9:25 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2109.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1428.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT IMPROVED COMPLIANCE AWARENESS ACT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4470) to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act with respect to the requirements related to lead in drinking water, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4470

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act".

SEC. 2. ENFORCEMENT OF DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS.

Section 1414(c) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-3(c)) is amended—

(1) in the header, by inserting "STATES, THE ADMINISTRATOR, AND" before "PERSONS SERVED";

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "paragraph (2)(E)" and inserting "paragraph (2)(F)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) Notice of any exceedance at the 90th percentile of a lead action level in a regulation promulgated under section 1412.";

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking "subparagraph (D)" and inserting "subparagraph (E)";

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the header, by striking "VIOLATIONS" and inserting "NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS";

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(I) by inserting " , and each exceedance described in paragraph (1)(D)," after "for each violation"; and

(II) by inserting "or exceedance" after "Each notice of violation";

(iii) by inserting "or exceedance" after "the violation" each place it appears; and

(iv) in clause (iv)—

(I) in subclause (I), by striking "broadcast media" and inserting "media, including broadcast media,";

(II) in subclause (II)—

(aa) by striking "in a newspaper of general circulation serving the area" and inserting "for circulation in the affected area, including in a newspaper of general circulation serving the area,"; and

(bb) by striking "or the date of publication of the next issue of the newspaper"; and

(III) in subclause (III), by striking "in lieu of notification by means of broadcast media or newspaper";

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) NOTICE BY ADMINISTRATOR.—If, after 24 hours after the Administrator's notification under subsection (a)(1)(A), the State with primary enforcement responsibility or the owner or operator of the public water system has not issued a notice that is required under subparagraph (C) for an exceedance described in paragraph (1)(D), the Administrator shall issue such required notice pursuant to this paragraph.";

(4) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(A) by striking "subparagraph (A) and" and inserting "subparagraph (A),"; and

(B) by striking "subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (2)" and inserting "subparagraph (C) or (E) of paragraph (2), and notices issued by the Administrator with respect to public water systems serving Indian Tribes under subparagraph (D) of such paragraph";

(5) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking "the terms" and inserting "the terms 'action level,'"; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking "and (IV)" and inserting "(IV) the action level for the contaminant, and (V)"; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) EXCEEDANCE OF SAFE LEAD LEVEL.—

"(A) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall, in collaboration with owners and operators of public water systems and States, establish a strategic plan for how the Administrator, a State with primary enforcement responsibility, and owners and operators of public water systems shall conduct targeted outreach, education, technical assistance, and risk communication to populations affected by lead in a public water system, including dissemination of information described in subparagraph (C).

"(B) EPA INITIATION OF NOTICE.—

"(i) FORWARDING OF DATA BY EMPLOYEE OF EPA.—If the Environmental Protection Agency develops or receives, from a source other than the State or the public water system, data, which meets the requirements of section 1412(b)(3)(A)(ii), indicating that the drinking water of a person served by a public water system contains a level of lead that exceeds a lead action level promulgated under section 1412, the Administrator shall require an appropriate employee of the Agency to forward such data to the owner or operator of the public water system and to the State in which the exceedance occurred within a time period established by the Administrator.

"(ii) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION BY OWNER OR OPERATOR.—If an owner or operator of a public water system receives a notice under clause (i), the owner or operator, within a time period established by the Administrator, shall disseminate to affected persons the information described in subparagraph (C).

"(iii) CONSULTATION.—

“(I) DEADLINE.—With respect to an exceedance at the 90th percentile of a lead action level in a regulation promulgated under section 1412, if the owner or operator of the public water system does not disseminate, in the time period established by the Administrator, the information described in subparagraph (C), as required under clause (ii), not later than 24 hours after becoming aware of such failure to disseminate, the Administrator shall consult, within a period not to exceed 24 hours, with the applicable Governor to develop a plan, in accordance with the strategic plan, to disseminate such information to affected persons within 24 hours of the end of such consultation period.

“(II) DELEGATION.—The Administrator may only delegate the duty to consult under this clause to an employee of the Environmental Protection Agency who is working in the Office of Water, at the headquarters of the Agency, at the time of such delegation.

“(iv) DISSEMINATION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator shall, as soon as reasonably possible, disseminate to affected persons the information described subparagraph (C) if—

“(I) the Administrator and the applicable Governor do not agree on a plan described in clause (iii)(I) during the consultation period under such clause; or

“(II) the applicable Governor does not disseminate the information within 24 hours of the end of such consultation period.

“(C) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—Information required to be disseminated under this paragraph shall include a clear explanation of the exceedance of a lead action level, its potential adverse effects on human health, the steps that the owner or operator of the public water system is taking to correct the exceedance, and the necessity of seeking alternative water supplies until the exceedance is corrected.

“(6) PRIVACY.—Any notice under this subsection to the public or an affected person shall protect the privacy of individual customer information.”.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF LEAD PIPES, SOLDER, AND FLUX.

Section 1417 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-6) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)(2)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) IDENTIFICATION AND NOTICE.—Each owner or operator of a public water system shall identify and provide notice to persons who may be affected by—

“(I) lead contamination of their drinking water where such contamination results from—

“(aa) the lead content in the construction materials of the public water distribution system; or

“(bb) corrosivity of the water supply sufficient to cause leaching of lead; or

“(II) an exceedance at the 90th percentile of a lead action level in a regulation promulgated under section 1412.

“(ii) MANNER AND FORM.—Notice under this paragraph shall be provided in such manner and form as may be reasonably required by the Administrator. Notwithstanding clause (i)(II), notice under this paragraph shall be provided notwithstanding the absence of a violation of any national drinking water standard.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking “The requirements” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The requirements”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “Enforcement of such requirements shall be carried out by a State with primary enforcement responsibility or the Administrator, as appropriate.

“(B) NOTIFICATION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—In the case of an exceedance described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)(II), if the public water system or the State in which the public water system is located does not notify the persons who may be affected by such exceedance in accordance with subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall notify such persons of such exceedance in accordance with subsection (a)(2), including notification of the relevant concentrations of lead. Such notice shall protect the privacy of individual customer information.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) PUBLIC EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall make information available to the public regarding lead in drinking water, including information regarding—

“(A) risks associated with lead in drinking water;

“(B) the likelihood that drinking water in a residence may contain lead;

“(C) steps States, public water systems, and consumers can take to reduce the risks of lead; and

“(D) the availability of additional resources that consumers can use to minimize lead exposure, including information on how to sample for lead in drinking water.

“(2) VULNERABLE POPULATIONS.—In making information available to the public under this subsection, the Administrator shall carry out targeted outreach strategies that focus on educating groups within the general population that may be at greater risk than the general population of adverse health effects from exposure to lead in drinking water.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we weren't here today. I wish this bill was not necessary, but it is. Our hearts go out to the folks of Flint, Michigan. The system let them down at every level. That is, frankly, unacceptable.

All folks want is the peace of mind that their government is looking out for their best interest and that their water is safe. This bill is the first step.

Imagine if you went to draw a cup of cold water from your kitchen faucet and suddenly had to think about whether it is safe to drink or not. Now put yourself into the shoes of a parent whose son or daughter has already taken a drink from that faucet. Or, you made coffee or infant formula. What health risk has your child already been exposed to? What do we do now? How can we expect a family to live life day-to-day without safe drinking water? And, after all those initial concerns,

you begin asking yourself: How is this situation possible in the 21st century in the United States of America?

We have been seeking answers to that question from EPA, from the State of Michigan, and from others. In the meantime, we know that part of the answer—certainly, not the whole story—is that there was a terrible breakdown in communication at every level of government.

It is sickening and it breaks your heart that thousands of kids indeed could be at risk, being poisoned from faucets that they thought were safe.

Government officials knew there was serious cause for concern and failed to inform the people of Flint. Many of those officials did not even seem to be effectively communicating and sharing data among themselves.

The EPA regional office was not telling headquarters about everything, the State was not telling EPA everything, and we don't know yet what the city of Flint was telling the State or EPA. That has got to be fixed—and it has got to be fixed now.

□ 1230

The Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act ensures that the public learns of excessive lead levels in their drinking water by setting forth how and when States, EPA, and public water utilities communicate their findings.

The bill also strengthens public notification rules when lead levels are exceeded. Individual consumers will be told when their own house tests positive for lead problems. And if the community or States fail to notify the public, EPA will step in and do so. They are required to do that.

The bill also requires EPA to create a strategic plan for handling and improving information flow among water utilities, the States, EPA, and affected drinking water consumers before there is an enforceable lead exceedance in drinking water. Let me repeat that: before lead levels get too high.

Finally, this bipartisan bill requires consumer notification when water being transported in a lead pipe is so corrosive that, in fact, it could leach into public drinking water.

I want to thank all Members of the House for their support, especially my Michigan colleagues, every one of which, from both parties, signed as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

I want to particularly thank Mr. KILDEE, a friend, who led this effort.

I thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, particularly FRANK PALLONE, JOHN SHIMKUS, and PAUL TONKO, for their advice, collaboration, and support.

I also want to thank two McCarthys, KEVIN MCCARTHY, for scheduling this at almost a moment's notice, and my lead counsel on this legislation, Dave McCarthy, who helped write and improve the bill as it was originally introduced.

What is said on this floor today will not do anything to ease the mind of a

parent in Flint. The entire situation breaks your heart, but we have a responsibility, working together as Republicans and Democrats, to fix the problem. This bill is an important step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4470, the Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act, introduced last week by our colleague Representative KILDEE, with the support of other members of the Michigan delegation.

This bill would strengthen requirements to have the EPA notify the public when concentrations of lead exceed Federal standards. That is notifying the public.

While I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to support it, far more than this is needed to address the many failings that led to the tragic circumstances that are still being experienced by the residents of Flint, Michigan, a situation that has drawn the Nation's attention and drawn compassion for children and their families. This should never have occurred in any city in our Nation.

As with any such tragic failure, there is an attempt to assess blame. Well, accountability is important. Those who failed in their responsibility should be held accountable.

But no one here has yet taken responsibility for our part, Congress' part, in this event. Collectively, this Congress as well as many previous Congresses have failed to maintain Federal support for the maintenance and improvements of our water infrastructure.

We have been underfunding these systems for decades. The poor condition of the water treatment and distribution system in Flint set the stage for this tragedy.

We are doing this in an attempt to save money. Well, in fact, we are wasting many millions of dollars more by allowing essential infrastructure to deteriorate to the extent where a constant stream of emergency responses and repairs are required to keep these systems working.

Finally, we need to do something for the people of Flint. The State of Michigan and President Obama's administration have both begun to mobilize resources to deal with the immediate need for safe drinking water, and they are working to eliminate lead from the water distribution system. But we still don't know if essential corrosion control can be reestablished.

And bottled water does not solve Flint's problems. The residents of Flint need a fully functioning public water system that delivers safe, clean water to their homes, to their schools, and to their businesses. We need to work with the State of Michigan to make that happen.

We need to care for the people who were exposed to lead, especially our children, who are most vulnerable to lead exposure. They need treatment

and sustained assistance to deal with the health problems they may experience as a result of this manmade disaster.

The conditions that enabled this crisis to happen are not unique to Flint. And while this bill is a first step to help communities that may face these problems in the future, it cannot be our last step. We must embrace our responsibility to support Federal investment in drinking water systems.

The public health and future prosperity of the people of Flint and thousands of other communities across our great Nation are continuing to suffer from the concerns and are counting on our progressive actions. I look forward to continuing this discussion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking my friends, DAN KILDEE and Chairman UPTON, for their work on this bipartisan legislation and ensuring a swift congressional response to the ongoing water crisis in Flint, Michigan.

What have we learned, and what will we do both now and into the future, Mr. Speaker, is the question.

What happened in Flint is not a natural disaster. It is a human disaster and a failure of government at every level.

In my questioning at last week's Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing, it became very clear that individuals with the EPA knew about the high lead levels in the drinking water for months but failed to communicate this information to the people of Flint, even under repeated Freedom of Information Act requests.

The bill we are considering today takes important steps to strengthen Federal requirements on the EPA to notify the public when concentrations of lead in drinking water are above Federal requirements.

I am glad the entire Michigan delegation is backing this bill; and I am committed to continuing to work together to get answers and help the families in Flint who need clean water and, for that matter, Mr. Speaker, learning from this for the families in the entire United States to make sure that this doesn't happen to them as well.

Mr. Speaker, in America, in the 21st century, children should not have to worry about safe and clean drinking water. The Flint water crisis never should have happened, and we must take action to ensure it never happens again.

Making things right must be a cooperative effort at every level, and this bill takes important steps to ensure proper coordination going forward.

I offer all of my support, all of my assistance, all of my help and my votes to make sure this happens.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michi-

gan (Mr. KILDEE), who has carried the concern and the emotion of this situation as the Representative in the House of Flint, Michigan. His energetic efforts, his determination, his obvious passion for getting this done, getting some relief, the relief essential for Flint done, is tremendously moving.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank Mr. TONKO for his comments and his support and leadership on this issue.

And I would like him to please extend my thanks to Ranking Member PALLONE for his effort and his support. I know he is dealing with a difficult time himself right now, and we extend our best wishes to him.

I want to thank all of my Michigan colleagues for joining as original cosponsors of this legislation; and I particularly thank Chairman UPTON for his help, his guidance, his assistance and, really, collaboration on getting a piece of legislation put together that we think is very helpful in preventing another situation such as what has occurred in my hometown from ever happening again in the United States.

I again thank Mr. UPTON for his assistance and leadership on this.

Flint is my home. The people I represent are the people I grew up with in Flint, Michigan. It is a great community. It has been through some struggles, for sure, in the last few decades, but we have never dealt with anything quite like this, something so fundamental as safe drinking water that we take for granted.

You turn on the faucet, as Mr. UPTON said, you expect the water that comes out of that faucet to be safe for yourself, for your children, to make formula, to cook food, to drink. And because of a series of decisions that really are almost incomprehensible in their impact, people in Flint, Michigan, can't drink their water; 100,000 people can't drink the water.

The thing that makes me most upset—sad, yes, but also angry—is that this crisis, this situation, which will last for decades in its impact, was completely avoidable.

Unlike a lot of other struggles that my hometown has faced as a result of big changes in the economy—development patterns, et cetera—this was a series of decisions that we can easily identify that could easily have been prevented with just more thought and more care and, in this case, a stronger set of requirements for disclosure when lead levels are elevated in a drinking water system.

So this legislation is one step. It is not the total solution. We really have to deal—and I hope my colleagues will also join us—with putting together a response to the crisis being felt by the people in Flint right now.

This bill, unfortunately, is too late to help them, but it can help the next Flint, perhaps. This would require the EPA to provide notice if the State agency responsible for enforcement of the clean drinking water laws does not act to provide notice to the citizens affected and to the water system.

Let me just be clear on that. The State of Michigan, in the case of the Flint situation, has primacy in terms of enforcement of these laws. It is their obligation to ensure that the clean drinking water laws are enforced, to collect data, to do sampling and testing, and to provide remediation, to provide intervention, if, in fact, it is not the case.

So, yes, there has been a failure of government, but I think we have to take care not to attempt to create some sort of false sense of equivalency of responsibility.

The city of Flint, for example, which is the most local level of government and where the water system is operated, was under the control of an emergency manager, a State official appointed to overtake operation of the city of Flint. So to the extent that the city was responsible, the city was the State in this regard.

In terms of the Federal role, there was apparent confusion or disagreement as to whether the EPA had authority, absent State notification to the public of the data that they had, whether the EPA had authority to go public, to make it clear that there was a problem. This legislation addresses that.

This legislation strengthens the hand of those who work at the EPA and actually requires them—not simply allows, but requires them—to provide notice to the public and to a water system operator in the event that the State fails to do so. Had that happened, it would not have prevented the bad decisions that led to this crisis, but it would have prevented them from going on for months and months and months with no action to protect the people in Flint.

This is important legislation. We need more. We need help for the people of Flint. But this is a step in the right direction in preventing what happened in Flint from happening to another community.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time I have remaining on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) has 11½ minutes remaining.

□ 1245

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), again, an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Flint, Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his leadership in this matter and for raising our attention to this.

Also, I would like to thank Chairman UPTON for his leadership for the Michigan delegation in bringing us together and putting aside any partisan differences to address a need of our great State and, also, for the children and families across our country.

I have spent my entire life in the State of Michigan. I was born there and raised there. Many generations before me were the same, born and raised in Michigan. My current family, my wife and my three kids, also live in Michigan and will also, I am sure, see to it that their children live there as well.

When I learned what happened in Flint, I was absolutely heartbroken. Frankly, it frightens me to think that a failure of this magnitude could happen in the 21st century and in our State.

Can you imagine not being able to drink the water from your own tap? What if you weren't able to bathe or take a shower because of fear of what might be in the water? The anger and the frustration is palpable, and it should be.

My district borders on Congressman KILDEE's, and I can tell you firsthand the crisis not only affects and impacts the community of Flint, but the entire Great Lakes State.

For weeks I have seen local high schools, veterans groups, and concerned citizens—you name it—people from all over Michigan, rising up to address the crisis and to help the residents, the families, and children of Flint.

When it comes to local, State, and Federal leadership, we must do everything possible to help as well. Every single one of us here today has a duty to ensure families and children are safe and have access to the essentials, the most basic of which is clean drinking water from household faucets.

Sure, we can point fingers and play the blame game. But when it comes down to fixing it, we must do so fast. We need more action than words. We need solutions.

What Chairman UPTON and Congressman KILDEE have proposed is a first-step solution to ensure this won't happen again.

First and foremost, this legislation makes sure the EPA will step in and notify the public when they know concentrations of lead in drinking water are above Federal requirements. It also streamlines communication between utilities, the States, the EPA, and the affected customers.

The entire delegation of the State of Michigan and Congress agree that this is a crisis. But to be clear, this is not a Democratic or Republican issue. I would say shame on anyone who attempts to capitalize on this issue or use the families of Flint in this crisis to further their own personal agenda. This is about common sense and delivering solutions to these children and families.

I ask my colleagues on behalf of both sides of the aisle to join Michigan and help us take action.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE). She is another member of the Michigan delegation.

Representative BRENDA LAWRENCE has shown great leadership in her role

on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and, again, has been a passionate voice to address the families of Flint.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the crisis in Flint demands action. I ran for Congress after serving as a mayor because I felt strongly that our government has a responsibility.

When you ask for a vote, you are asking for the trust in our government. We betrayed the trust of our citizens when we did not provide a human need, and that is clean water.

I stand here today encouraged. I ran on the premise that we need to work together as a government. I can tell you that this crisis in Flint is not a political issue. It is a moral issue. It is why each of us in Congress sit here today on the vote of the people's trust, and that is to take care of this great country.

It is a moral issue, and it calls for all of us in Congress to act. Today I am standing here with a sense of hope being fulfilled that we have eliminated the aisle, and we are standing here together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4470, the Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act. This bill will ensure that EPA notifies communities of lead contamination if State or local agencies fail to do so. That clearly is what happened in Flint.

Local water authorities will have to provide notification to the public when lead contamination is a result of lead from pipes and other infrastructure leaching into the water supply. This notice will have to be provided to affected residents, regardless of whether any drinking water standards were violated.

If the operator does not notify the public—in this case, it was Michigan Environmental Quality—if they do not notify the public, then the EPA must do so. This is precisely what happened in Flint.

State officials repeatedly ignored the pleas of the residents and those we are calling civic heroes from outside and experts about the lead levels.

Passing this bill today will ensure that the situation in Flint—and I am joining with my Republican colleagues and Democratic—never happens again in our United States. The decision to share that type of critical information should not be based on political judgment.

H.R. 4470 will ensure that residents acquire the information they need about their drinking water systems and give EPA the ability and responsibility to step in and notify residents if a State or water system fails to act.

H.R. 4470 is just the first step, as we heard, in addressing our country's drinking water infrastructure issue. I hope that we can continue to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure that Flint never happens again.

This is the first step in fixing our infrastructure in America because other

Members of Congress have talked about lead water crises in their communities. So this is a first step.

For me, this is a fulfilling day to stand here and support my colleagues, regardless of our political affiliation, and take care of the people of America.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR). Again, he is a cosponsor of Mr. KILDEE's bill.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join my Michigan colleagues as a cosponsor of this legislation and thank Representative KILDEE and Chairman UPTON for bringing this legislation forward.

Our hearts go out to the people of Flint who are enduring so much and persevering during this time. It is heartwarming to see the way people across the country have come together in support of the people of Flint.

The sad thing is that this situation could have been prevented and should have been prevented. The legislation we are discussing today here in the House of Representatives is because of failures in local, State, and Federal Government.

The fact is that the officials at the EPA knew last April—10 months ago—that the Flint Utilities Department was not using corrosion controls, putting water safety at risk.

Instead of alerting the public, the EPA stayed silent. When an EPA employee tried to speak out, he was silenced. The EPA deferred to a State agency, the MDEQ, which also failed to tell the public.

Last month the EPA administrator sent a memo creating a formal policy on the importance of assessing and responding to critical public health issues. That the administrator had to remind employees of the importance of public health speaks to the misplaced priority of the EPA and its officials.

So today we have to pass a law requiring the Agency to notify the public when water quality is unsafe and constitutes a public health threat. This legislation is a reminder to the EPA that it needs to focus on its core responsibility with safe drinking water, using its authority appropriately, rather than overreaching outside of its jurisdiction.

This is an example of one community that has been adversely affected. Flint is not alone in this challenge, and this has ramifications all across our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for another individual to offer testimony.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), another cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Chairman UPTON and Representative KILDEE for their important, bipartisan work on this issue.

I rise today in support of the Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act. This bill is a step in the right direction to preserve and protect the health of our citizens.

The legislation requires the EPA administrator to work with States and local water authorities to develop a strategic plan for addressing lead contaminants in drinking water. This important legislation will ensure that the complete failure to notify people of a health risk, which occurred in Flint, does not happen again.

This is an issue that many communities across our country will have to deal with as our water system infrastructure ages. We must ensure that the public is aware, our citizens are informed, and that our water authorities and agencies identify and take steps to prevent this level of failure from happening again.

Mr. Speaker, on the Federal level, it is unacceptable that the EPA, an agency with a budget of over \$8 billion, did not escalate its concerns over the presence of lead contaminants.

This is an agency that is literally paid to protect the public health and environment, and it failed. This failure may not happen again. All Americans should feel safe drinking water from their kitchen sink.

This legislation is a commonsense solution. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this act. I thank the chairman for his hard work and the committee's hard work on this bill.

I will be exceedingly brief because certainly, as has been outlined by any number of different speakers, this is about a failure of government at a multitude of different levels, at the State, local, and Federal levels, a real failure and real consequences to the people of Flint.

It is also, I think, a reminder to all of us of the significance of bracket creep in government; wherein, if everybody is involved, nobody is involved; if everybody is accountable, nobody is accountable.

That is true of a government at a government level. It is true of a regulatory body. The importance of clearly defined missions I think is part of what your strategic plan really gets at in this act, and I admire your work on that.

I also want to just reference that this is also a reminder, a wake-up call, if you will, on the importance of watching out for unsustainable political promises.

I say that because, if you look at the general budget and the general fund within Flint, basically one-third of their revenue goes to pay for retiree benefits.

That number by the year 2020 is going to rise to essentially 40 percent,

40 percent. I bring that up because it is indeed a wake-up call to the unsustainability of our Federal promises as you look at the numbers going forward at the Federal level.

So my heart goes out to the people of Flint. I think that this is an important measure going forward, but it is also an important reminder to every one of us here at the Federal level to watch out for the unsustainable promises here in Washington.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Michigan has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I appreciate all the comments and the support, especially the sympathy and, really, unity with the people of my hometown of Flint.

I do want to ensure, though, that we are properly characterizing the legislation, its reasoning, and its impact.

The legislation would actually not just require EPA to provide notice, but would require the local jurisdiction, the State agency, to provide them with the opportunity to do what they should do anyway, that is, to provide notice. Absent their willingness to do so, the EPA would then be required.

It is an important distinction because, in this case, the State of Michigan has primacy in enforcement of these rules.

The EPA in the case of Flint did take action when they learned of the elevated lead levels. The action was to repeatedly reach out to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality and insist that they enforce the lead and copper rule.

Actually, they went so far as to insist that they initiate corrosion control, which is the mechanism by which lead leaching would have been prevented.

□ 1300

Not only did the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality fail to act, they actually told the EPA almost a year ago that they actually had initiated corrosion control when they had not.

I think it would be a mistake to create some sort of equivalency between the role of the EPA and the role of the State of Michigan in this. It was the State of Michigan that had prime responsibility that failed.

The EPA, while I would have preferred that they had shouted from the mountaintop that they were having this problem getting the lead agency to enforce the rule, there was at least confusion as to whether or not they had the authority to do so. Even today, the State of Michigan continues to push back on the EPA's attempts to

test water to insist on enforcement. It is an important distinction to make.

Regarding my friend Mr. SANFORD's comments, I appreciate his reflection on the financial situation within the city of Flint. While that is a set of questions that clearly needs attention, the truth of the matter is, had the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality insisted on the use of corrosion control in the Flint water system, as the law would require, the cost would have been \$140 a day. All of this could have been prevented by the State simply requiring that \$140 a day be spent.

This legislation is important in preventing this from happening again so that an agency of a State that refuses to enforce the law at least can't do so in the dark; and if the State won't give public notice, it would require the EPA to do so. This is an important step. We have crafted this legislation to make sure that each level of government is transparent when it comes to these issues.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, let me again offer my appreciation to Chairman UPTON and our ranking member, Representative PALLONE, for their leadership on this and for working in a spirit of bipartisanship to bring this measure to the floor and in working with the Michigan delegation and, in particular, Representative KILDEE, who has been directly impacted on behalf of Flint, Michigan, which he represents.

I would also make certain that we remember that under the Safe Drinking Water Act, as Representative KILDEE indicated, States have primacy, an important issue for Members who frequently talked about empowering our State and local governments. It is a State's responsibility when they accept that role of primacy to run these systems and comply with Federal standards.

Before we point fingers at the EPA, let's remember that Congress has cut its budget year after year. We want them to do more with less. We have passed the point of achieving efficiency, we have cut valuable staffing, and we have cut valuable programs.

We can point to failures by all levels of government in this situation, but the public doesn't want to hear us blame anyone. They want and deserve real solutions and financial assistance to address the crisis at hand.

We need to help the people of Flint and better protect our public health going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. TONKO said this bill is not about a blame game. We are trying to fix a problem so it doesn't happen again anyway.

I just might note that the House was out 2 weeks. We had Martin Luther King week, then we had the snowstorm, and we couldn't come back.

Our committee held a number of briefings. I expanded it to include certainly all of the members—Republican and Democrat—on the Energy and Commerce Committee, but I also extended that out to all of the members of the Michigan delegation, both our Senators, as well as the Oversight and Government Reform Committee majority and minority staff.

Mr. KILDEE mentioned about Mr. PALLONE not being here. His father died earlier this week, so he is where he should be. But he cares deeply about this legislation as well.

I know when I sat down with my friend Mr. KILDEE last week to talk about the intent of this legislation and where he was, we were able to, I think, make some important, constructive changes that strengthen the bill. It was a no-brainer for us to get every Member on both sides of the aisle from Michigan to be an original cosponsor, and I congratulate him for that initiative.

But I must say, too, this is a first step. I know in the future our committee is going to be looking at how we can better expand flexibility, I think, of States as it relates to their safe drinking water fund, and the State revolving fund as well. We are looking to hear from the States what we might be able to do on the Federal response. Again, the primacy is at the State and local level, particularly when a State, like we have seen here, actually has been given an emergency declaration, as our Governor sought.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I commend Mr. KILDEE.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act and am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, which will strengthen public notification requirements in the event of lead contamination.

The situation in Flint is unacceptable—it is a violation of the right to clean water and a breakdown of the basic responsibility of government to its citizens. And it was completely preventable—we know the damaging impacts of lead and we know how to protect people from lead poisoning. We need an aggressive response, both for the people in Flint and for every community that faces lead exposure.

Today's bill is just a first step to address this problem by ensuring that when contamination occurs, communities will be informed of what is happening and what will be done to fix it. We should follow this action with support for the Flint community and robust funding for lead poisoning prevention and clean water programs. I look forward to our continued work to protect children and communities from the dangers of lead.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act, as amended. This bill will allow more transparency and increase education and outreach efforts to communities about their drinking water systems.

Communities are entitled to information about their drinking water, and we should make every effort to ensure that Americans receive clear, concise and timely information about the safety of that water. This bill addresses a concern raised during the Flint water crisis about the significant delay in informing Flint residents about the dangerous levels of lead in their water. I greatly appreciate the work of Mr. KILDEE and the Michigan Delegation in coming together and quickly putting forward this legislation. It is a good place to begin our efforts to help Flint and I support its passage.

Yet, this is a small, first step and does not address the imminent and long-term problems facing our nation's water systems. I know my friend from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, agrees with me on this and has put forward legislation focusing on immediate and long-term investments for Flint to address both its health and infrastructure needs. We must do more for Flint and more to ensure that our nation as a whole receives safe, clean drinking water at the tap.

As I have stated time and again, our drinking water systems are deteriorating. Transparency is important, but we need to follow this effort with a reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act that increases the investment in our drinking water systems.

We must invest in our drinking water infrastructure to repair, maintain, and replace aging pipes. We also must equip communities with the resources to ensure the delivery of safe drinking water, safeguard systems from vulnerabilities such as climate change, and encourage good financial and environmental management of water systems. There is no doubt that this will be a large task, but we cannot shy away from it. The longer we delay, the more costly the investment.

This should be a wakeup call that we cannot continue to stand by watching as Flint—and far too many other American communities—are exposed to unsafe drinking water. We must take action now.

Again, I commend Mr. KILDEE and the cosponsors for their efforts on this legislation. I thank the Gentleman and his staff for working with me and my staff to ensure this bill will truly increase transparency for communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to additional opportunities to work in a bipartisan fashion in the remaining months of this Congress on the pressing issue of safe, reliable drinking water for all Americans.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4470, the Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act. This bill is a good first step to helping ensure the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) never again allows an intransigent state government endanger the public welfare.

Let there be no mistake. The blame for what happened in Flint lies directly at the feet of Governor Snyder who ignored Flint's democratic rights, his appointed Emergency Managers who wanted to save a buck, and the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) that was too timid to protect the public from haphazard changes to the Flint water system.

But the EPA needs to take some blame for not dismissing out of hands the efforts of the Governor, his Emergency Managers, and MDEQ to delay addressing the crisis in Flint.

The EPA let the endless echo of “EPA overreach” prevent them from doing their job—which is telling anti-regulatory special interests that the public’s health comes first.

This bill is a start to fixing that problem, but we have a long way to go. My colleagues across the aisle need to stop fighting EPA on behalf of special interests, and start fighting alongside EPA in the public interest.

Because if they don’t, there will be more Flints, there will be more mothers who can’t sleep because their children are sick, and there will be more “bi-partisan” bills expressing hindsight support for EPA action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4470, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3442, DEBT MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3293, SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 609 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 609

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3442) to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments

are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3293) to provide for greater accountability in Federal funding for scientific research, to promote the progress of science in the United States that serves that national interest. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a rule and the underlying bills, both of which will enhance accountability and create better processes for our Federal Government.

Necessary legislation is what we are talking about today. Legislation that will help the Federal Government not only in its processes, but that will allow the American people to have con-

fidence in what their government does not only on their behalf, but for a better future for the American citizens, including our children and grandchildren.

We are here today because these are important issues, and we are addressing them. That is what Speaker RYAN wants this body to be doing. Speaker RYAN wants us to bring our best ideas to the floor, to make sure the American people understand what they are, to fully debate them, and to have all the open processes that are necessary to make sure that we are bringing to the American people the best ideas of their elected representatives. That is why we are here today.

I also want to point out that the Rules Committee, of which I am chairman, asked Members to submit their ideas and amendments regarding these bills, and 14 amendments were made in order. That means that the Rules Committee met, we looked, and we had discussions with Members about the ideas that they have. Fourteen were made in order last night by the Rules Committee, and I am proud of that.

As a result, our resolution provides that H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015, which was altered and supported by the gentleman from Coppel, Texas, Congressman KENNY MARCHANT, and H.R. 3293, the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act, which was brought to the committee by the young chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, LAMAR SMITH from San Antonio, Texas, will both be considered today under a structured rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would normally run through my opening dialogue that I would have about what is in these bills, why they are important, and what they would do. But because of time considerations today, one of our newest Members of Congress wants to speak. He has got a meeting in a few minutes. I would like to ask him if he would at this time take part in my opening statement.

I yield to the gentleman from Windsor, Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

□ 1315

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for years, our Nation has limped along from debt crisis to debt crisis. Every time, we say to ourselves “just a little more spending today, and we will fix this mess tomorrow,” but tomorrow never seems to come, and the ocean of red ink gets deeper and deeper with each passing day. Thanks to this “spend now” and “save never” mentality, the national debt has soared to \$19 trillion, and there is no end in sight. The Federal Government has been overspending for so long that we are financially bankrupt. If we continue to pass this debt on to our children and grandchildren, we are also morally bankrupt. We need a solution to our constant budget busting.

H.R. 3442 will help our Nation address this fiscal crisis. By requiring the administration to testify before Congress,

we are requiring them to bring realistic, serious solutions to the table. We are calling on them to offer a plan for actually reducing our debt, and—this is key—we are requiring these solutions before we reach the point of no return.

What we have wrought in debt and deficit isn't merely a fiscal challenge or an economic problem—it is poisonous to our human potential. It is time for the Federal Government to start making the same tough choices that small businesses and folks in Colorado are making every day, and this bill is a good start.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The original intent also of a piece of legislation that we have goes back to 1950. The legislation that created the National Science Foundation was there at the time to support science that was in the national interest. Unfortunately, the NSF has funded too many wasteful projects under the ideas that have been presented to us by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the purposes of which were probably nebulous at best, which would be the argument that Chairman LAMAR SMITH made with us, and which were, clearly, not necessarily in the national interest.

We heard testimony that every single project that the National Science Foundation handled was in the American people's best interest. We think that our discussion with Members of Congress today will show them that we need to change the wording to where the national interest is obligatory to a proposal before a proposal is given. You have to prove it is in the Nation's best interest to spend money. Examples of such projects include \$700,000 to create a climate change-themed musical, \$38,000 to study prehistoric rabbit hunting on the Iberian Peninsula, and—perhaps my favorite of all—\$605,000 to study why people around the world cheat on their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this is hard-earned money that was spent that I do not believe was in the national interest. "In the interest of the Nation" means that it needs to be prioritized and that it needs to be something that would produce an outcome that would, from the National Science Foundation, benefit the American people.

H.R. 3293 directly benefits the American people by promoting greater accountability—a mission statement, so to speak—in funding scientific research, not only at the NSF, but that also ensures that the research conducted is always in the national interest.

This is, I believe, a commonsense, bipartisan answer. Certainly, LAMAR SMITH, as the chairman of the committee, brought forth the ideas on a bipartisan basis to ensure that what we would do is not get in the way of any projects that are currently out there. Instead, anything that is in the future would have to subscribe to the conditions of the national interest.

Reckless and mandatory spending has placed our national finances and our economy—including our jobs, our infrastructure, and our future—in peril. Today, the total debt is subject to the limit, which includes Treasury securities held by Federal trust funds and other accounts, which stand at over \$19 trillion. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office projects that the 2016 deficit will be \$544 billion. You can see that we are not just at \$19 trillion but that we are adding to that.

Mr. Speaker, you know and I know, in just a matter of weeks, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE), the chairman of the Budget Committee, will be bringing forth to this floor bills that address what our year is going to look like in 2017. The President of the United States has a chance to do this. Every year, the President submits his budget. It is \$1 trillion more a year in spending. It is more government. It is more spending. It adds more things to our debt. Republicans, since 2011—since we have been in the majority—have tried to submit budgets that have held us in place; but by holding us in place, which is the best we can do, it does not mean that we were addressing creating a surplus, which would be required not to add to that debt.

So where we are is back to the American people again with an opportunity for them to understand our processes—a budget, an opportunity to get to where we do not add to the debt. Yet what we are here to do today is not the budget but to address what we do under a circumstance when we have a debt limit by which we have met the constitutional constraints, the legal constraints, and what we are going to do in moving forward.

We are taking a bill that comes directly from KENNY MARCHANT, who is a member of our Ways and Means Committee, who has spent a number of years in thinking through how we can put a spotlight—how we can put the light of day—on this issue to the point at which we can talk about it, understand more about it, and do something about it. That is also the second bill: the National Science Foundation, what is in the national interest, and, clearly, looking at the debt.

If we are going to have a debt limit increase, how do we as Members of Congress, under our constitutional powers, understand not just the issue but also the obligation that we have when we take votes so that we know what is at risk, what the plan would be, and, perhaps more importantly, how we can work together with the administration—Republicans and Democrats—to make sure we get a better answer.

Now, there is one last point that needs to be made, and I think it was made yesterday in the committee, not just by the gentleman TOM COLE, not just by VIRGINIA FOXX from North Carolina, and not just by me, which is that we don't know who the President is going to be next year. We don't know

who the Secretary of the Treasury is going to be next year. The gentleman, the author of the bill, thinks that that is a prime reason his legislation should be a bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation so that we are saying whoever it is has the authority and the responsibility to come to Congress and give us the insight.

Let's work together so that we avoid debt, so that we avoid making a mistake, and, mostly, so that we are on the same page together. That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my good friend and distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 3293, a bill to hamstring the National Science Foundation and its gold standard review process; and I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3442, a misnamed debt management bill that provides Congress with no new information about the debt limit and that does nothing to actually prevent default.

Despite a promise from Speaker RYAN and House Republican leadership for an open and deliberative process, this rule makes in order only 14 of the 47 amendments that were submitted on both pieces of legislation to our committee—only six amendments for the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's bill and eight for the debt limit bill. Democrats on the Rules Committee offered an open rule so that both Democratic and Republican Members could have an opportunity to make their views known on this bill, but as has become the custom, the Democrats voted for an open process, and every single Republican voted against an open process.

Members should have the opportunity to offer their ideas on the House floor, and we should be having a robust debate on these issues. Here is a crazy idea, Mr. Speaker: Maybe, if we actually opened up the process and allowed for a full debate, we could actually pass bipartisan legislation that would move through the legislative process and then go on to the President's desk where he would then sign it into law. Yet, for the most part, my friends on the other side of the aisle don't seem interested in working with Democrats to advance common goals that will actually help the American people, and the legislation before us today is no exception.

H.R. 3442 requires the Secretary of the Treasury to appear before Congress and submit a report on the administration's debt reduction proposals. I have got some good news for my friends. The

Treasury Secretary already regularly meets with Congress to discuss the debt limit, and the President offers proposals to address the debt and the deficit in his annual budgets. I would say to my colleagues on the Republican side that it is okay—you can ask questions. That is what hearings are for. You can ask questions about the debt and deficit reduction.

In fact, just yesterday, President Obama sent his fiscal year 2017 budget request to Congress, which included over \$2.9 trillion in deficit reduction over the coming decade—this on top of the \$4 trillion to \$5 trillion in deficit reduction already achieved since 2010. If my friends are interested in hearing about these proposals to reduce our deficit, perhaps they should reconsider their unprecedented and insulting decision to exclude the OMB from testifying on the administration's budget proposal. Such a contemptuous attitude demeans Congress and the American people.

In addition to its annual budget, the administration also provides the information requested by H.R. 3442 in the form of the Mid-Session Review, of the Daily Treasury Statement, of the Monthly Treasury Statement, of the Monthly Statement of the Public Debt, of the Schedules of Federal Debt, and of the Financial Report of the United States Government.

The Treasury manages our debt, but it is Congress that holds the power of the purse. It is our responsibility to raise the debt limit when it is reached, and I would point out that it is the legislative decisions made by Congress that determine the level of debt.

I say to my Republican friends, if you don't want to deal with the issue of raising the debt limit, then don't accumulate all of these bills. The debt limit debate is about making sure we live up to our financial obligations, the obligations that this Chamber agreed to.

Last night in the Rules Committee, we had a debate about deficit reduction and how to deal with the debt. Members on both sides of the aisle offered suggestions on ways to reduce our deficit, and that is an important discussion we should be having because it is a big issue. Yet this bill is not about deficit reduction; it is not about trying to get our debt under control; and it is not a serious attempt to help us avoid future default. The Republican majority has threatened default on at least three separate occasions: in 2011, when default was narrowly avoided with the Budget Control Act; in 2013, when Republican extremism led to a government shutdown, costing our fragile economy \$24 billion and 120,000 private sector jobs; and this past fall, when Democrats helped to pass the bipartisan budget agreement despite opposition from two-thirds of the Republicans in this Congress.

I would like to point out what is missing in this bill that we are going to be talking about later on this week. The report required by this legislation

would exclude the most important information Congress needs when the debt limit is reached, which is an analysis of the catastrophic consequences of default. If this were a serious attempt to address our debt, I would think that the majority would want to know which bills the Treasury would need to stop paying if Congress failed to raise the debt limit. Would veterans stop receiving their benefits? Would Medicare providers stop being reimbursed? Would students stop receiving Pell grants? The chairman of the Rules Committee said in his opening statement that the American people want us to do something. I agree.

□ 1330

This is not doing something. This is trying to point the finger somewhere else so that we can avoid responsibility for doing our job.

If we were serious about this issue, maybe we ought to think about actually passing legislation that would help reduce our deficit and pay down our debt. Maybe we ought to be talking about comprehensive immigration reform. CBO says that we would save hundreds of billions of dollars for our National Treasury if we actually did that, did something positive to resolve our immigration crisis and, in doing so, we would save all this money that could go to reducing our deficit.

Maybe one of the things we ought to be talking about here is actually not passing tax breaks for wealthy people that we don't pay for because that adds to the bills that we accumulate here in Congress. If you want to give Donald Trump another tax cut, pay for it. That is all.

Maybe we ought to talk about dealing with the issue of these war costs. I mean, we can't even come together and actually debate and vote on an AUMF as these new wars are popping up all over the world.

By the way, if we did, maybe we could talk about the cost, which, by the way, a big chunk of these war costs aren't even paid for. They are put on our credit card. I mean, the only people sacrificing in these wars are the men and women who we put in harm's way and their families. The rest of us do nothing. We don't even ask the American people to pay for it.

Well, here is an idea: if people don't want to pay for these wars, maybe we ought not to go. Just putting them on our credit card should not be an answer. Those are the kinds of things we should be talking about here today if we were serious about getting our budget under control.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is duplicative, unnecessary, and a waste of time. It does nothing to prevent future Republican threats of default, and I strongly oppose this effort.

This week, also, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are bringing to the floor H.R. 3293, another antiscience piece of legislation. Now, some might call this a thinly veiled attempt by the major-

ity to dictate what the National Science Foundation spends their funding on, but there really isn't even a thin veil trying to cover up what this is. This is a blatant attempt to coerce the NSF into only funding projects that fit into the Republican political messaging agenda.

The NSF receives upwards of 50,000 proposals a year. Out of all these proposals, only about 20 percent end up receiving funding. The NSF puts the applications through a rigorous process of peer review in order to determine which proposals they will fund.

I would like to emphasize the fact that this is a peer review, not a congressional review. It is a peer review. Congress does not review these applications because the vast majority of us are not scientists. I am not a scientist. I don't think many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are scientists.

The NSF review process is also designed to be confidential in order to protect against any internal or external bias. Injecting congressional interference and disruption into a well-functioning process will have a drastically negative effect.

Now, it should come as no surprise that a big part of the Republican majority's argument is that the NSF is focusing too much of its funding on projects studying climate change. I tried to figure out what the hook was, and I found that that is it.

I have said this here before, and I will keep saying it until we stop debating these ridiculous bills. We know that climate change is real. We see it. We live it. The scientific community overwhelmingly has verified it. Climate change is not a theory. It is not a hoax. It is not some silly fantasy. The NSF should be funding research that is directed toward understanding and mitigating the effects of climate change.

The majority on the Science Committee has been on a crusade to inject itself into NSF's independent grant review process. The committee has demanded an explanation on how roughly 40 studies could possibly serve our national interests. Now, we have seen time and time again that basic research leads to positive, life-changing outcomes never imagined by researchers.

Congress certainly does not have the experience or the knowledge to predetermine the future value of a research project. Just because the title of a project doesn't sound particularly overwhelmingly impressive doesn't mean it isn't, and we have a gazillion examples of that in the research that has been done in the NSF.

It is best to leave the scientific review process in the hands of our world-class scientists who resoundingly oppose efforts to interfere with NSF's rigorous review process. I join them in strong opposition to this bill.

Now, once again, Mr. Speaker, we are on the floor debating two bills that are going nowhere. Each bill has received a

veto threat from the White House because this is not serious legislation. Mr. Speaker, this is just more political fodder for the right wing of the Republican Party, sound bites for my friends on the other side of the aisle to use while on the campaign trail to attempt to sound like they are dealing with issues in a serious manner when, in fact, they are not. It doesn't matter what year it is. The American people elected us to solve problems, not pad Republicans' political talking points.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this restrictive rule and the two partisan pieces of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee made in order more amendments than Senator HARRY REID did as majority leader over 2 years—in just 1 day. In just 1 day, more amendments were made in order in the United States House of Representatives. So I get it. I do.

I think I would be on the defensive, also, if I were my colleagues, my friends that are Democrats, because what they are doing to this country doesn't work, and they are defensive about it. So they view anything that Republicans do, even on a bipartisan basis but doesn't fit their narrative as, "this is political."

Well, balancing the budget is in the best interest of the American people. Presenting realistic budgets—not a trillion dollars more in spending and bigger government—is exactly the kind of policies that Republicans do believe.

By the way, if they were really serious about trying to fix this global warming, they would look in their own backyard with home heating fuel, which is diesel fuel, which they are putting all through the Northeast to heat their homes. That is a huge contributor to global warming, as opposed to clean, natural gas. They can make their own decisions. But I would say back to them: I think you ought to measure three times and have seen once, not just go accusing other people of things.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, we had the gentleman from Coppel, Texas, KENNY MARCHANT, a great member of our Ways and Means Committee, come and testify about this bill, about how we look at raising the debt limit. He spoke very passionately, and there was a lot of common sense involved about how do we look at this issue and how do we solve it.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me and his support on this issue. Also, I thank him for allowing the Rules Committee to spend over an hour on this issue yesterday to hear both sides of this issue as far as the debt ceiling goes.

Mr. Speaker, I can't go to a townhall meeting or even go to a gathering of

just a few people without the subject of the debt ceiling coming up. My constituents on a regular basis, through emails, phone calls, and letters, ask me the questions: What is Congress doing about addressing the debt ceiling? Why do you lurch from year to year to year about the debt ceiling? Why don't you ever look at the debt ceiling in a comprehensive manner?

The debt is too high. When I introduced this bill in September, the debt had reached \$18.1 trillion. Today, it is over \$19 trillion. If the current law remains unchanged, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that the Federal debt held by the public will exceed 100 percent of our GDP in 25 years, and this is unsustainable.

The window to get a handle on the Nation's debt is closing very quickly. We need to enact solutions to retire the debt before it is too late. That is what the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act is all about.

This bill creates a new debt limit framework that places greater attention on finding debt reduction solutions. It does so by injecting transparency, accountability, and timeliness into the debt limit process. The bill would allow Congress and the administration to take comprehensive assessments of the debt and its drivers well before the statutory debt limit is reached.

Each year since I have been in Congress, I can pick up the newspaper one day and find that the Secretary of the Treasury announces that we have reached our statutory debt limit and usually proclaims a date. In this case, the statutory debt limit will be reached next March of 2017. At that point, everybody seems to go about their business. There is no particular action taken.

In fact, last month after that proclamation was made that we had reached our statutory debt ceiling, 7 months went by without us reaching the debt ceiling. How did that happen? Well, it happened because the Secretary of the Treasury has the ability to implement extraordinary measures. Now, if any committees in the Congress should know what those extraordinary measures that he is using are going to be or are, it is the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

So this bill very simply lays out a framework where, before the debt ceiling is reached—and the Secretary of Treasury knows that—he has a framework of up to 60 days to come and appear before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, which could be a joint meeting, and lay out for us when the debt ceiling will be reached—not after we have reached the debt ceiling, but before we have reached the debt ceiling—what extraordinary measures he will take once we have reached that debt ceiling and when, in fact, he thinks we will actually run out of money.

In that report, he will actually then lay out the administration's plan on

addressing that debt in the short term, in the midterm, and in the future. So it is a very commonsense plan. It involves one very specific meeting with these two jurisdictional committees with the Secretary of the Treasury. The whole focal point of that meeting will be to talk about the debt ceiling. That does not happen now.

We have dozens of reports that are online. We have dozens of discussions besides this, but never statutorily is the Secretary of the Treasury and the two jurisdictional committees required to meet and discuss this. This is the great thing about this bill, the implementation of this bill.

Like so many Americans, my constituents have watched with great concern as the debt has skyrocketed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MARCHANT. If we share these concerns at all—and I know that many of us do—we need to pass the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Maybe I can clear all this up so we don't have to debate this bill.

The gentleman asked a question about extraordinary measures that the Secretary of the Treasury could potentially use to deal with the debt ceiling. I would just tell him that they are defined in statute, and we will happily provide him a copy of the statute so that he can understand that.

I would go back to what I said in my opening statement that, if we are serious about dealing with our deficit and our debt, then maybe we ought to be thinking in these terms, about actually not accumulating all these bills that get us to the point where we have to raise the debt ceiling.

I mean, we in Congress—not the administration, but we in Congress—accumulate all these bills and all these financial obligations. Once you do that, you have to pay for them. Our constituents, when they accumulate credit card debt, they have got to pay it. They just can't not pay it because they don't want to. So we have to start behaving like adults here and understand that we need to pay our bills.

I would suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that one way we might want to save some money and not add it to the deficit or to our debt is to stop giving Donald Trump tax cuts that you don't pay for.

□ 1345

If you want to have tax cuts for wealthy individuals, fine. Pay for them. Don't not pay for them. Stop subsidizing big oil companies in this country.

Maybe there was a time when we first started exploring for oil that you

could make the case that taxpayers ought to be subsidizing oil companies. Not anymore. Not with global warming and certainly not when they are making zillions of dollars a year in profits. Maybe we could take that money and put it toward deficit reduction.

Or maybe we could pay for these wars that everybody seems to want to commit our young men and women to. If you want to go to war, you ought to pay for it, not just put it on a credit card. If you are not prepared to do that, then end these wars.

But just putting in danger the lives of our brave men and women and just accumulating all these massive bills that there is no accountability of I think is unconscionable.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I respect the motivation that underlies this bill. We have got a debt in this country that is too large, and we have got to address it, but this is a nonresponse.

The job of addressing the debt belongs to Congress. It can't be outsourced. The Secretary of the Treasury has no more authority to address the debt than the Secretary of Agriculture or Education or the Democratic National Committee or the Republican Campaign Committee. This is a job that has to be done, but it is our job to do it.

Asking the Secretary of the Treasury to come in and talk about when that date certain will be on default when we set that date when we pass budgets means that we are asking somebody else to do our job and asking somebody who actually doesn't even have the authority to do the job. That belongs to Congress.

Every time we vote on either a tax cut or an appropriation bill, it has clear implications for how that will impact on the debt ceiling. It is debatable because there are fluctuations as to when we will hit that date.

But it is absolutely certain that, when we appropriate money or we pass tax cuts, in one case spending will go up, and in the other case revenues will go down.

What we have done is gone along in a kind of la-la land where we think we can cut taxes, we can raise spending, and then we are astonished when a year or so later there is actually a bill that comes due.

This is not the debt management bill. It is not the fiscal responsibility bill. It is the debt mismanagement and fiscal irresponsibility bill.

Think about the things that we have done. Mr. MCGOVERN has been talking about it. But we had a war in Iraq, a trillion dollars. Nobody paid for that. We voted to spend a trillion dollars on tax cuts. We can have an argument about tax policy. But you know what, revenues went down.

Congress voted to spend \$800 billion on the prescription drug program, something that had bipartisan support.

Not paid for. And then just a few weeks ago we passed tax extenders that are going to reduce revenues by \$2 trillion.

Actions have consequences. The consequences are ones that are inevitable and foreseeable as a result of the actions of this Congress. This Congress, instead of assuming its responsibility, tries to outsource it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. WELCH. To someone else, it is a dodge. That is all it is. It is us trying to fool the American people with a game of three-card Monte where we are pretending that the problem that we are decrying had somehow mysteriously evolved out of nowhere.

I respect the concern of the authors of this bill about our debt. What I don't respect is the failure of Congress to address it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the reason why we are doing this is because one day 2 years ago the President, through the Treasury, wrote off \$339 billion in one day. That is not responsible. It didn't happen in one day.

They play games at Treasury. The President of the United States plays games with this issue. Now it sounds like my colleagues are, also. This is an honest attempt to have a dialogue.

Regardless of who is going to be President or whoever is going to be Treasury Secretary next year, we want to know what kind of games or what kind of straightforward business they are going to operate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting young Members of this Congress.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for referring to me as young and exciting. I am going to phone my wife to let her know that is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you today because I am in strong support of H.R. 3442. I think that sometimes we make this a Democratic versus Republican issue. Responsibility is not a political issue. It is a moral issue.

Irresponsibility is the problem that we have. I wish we could go away from making political talking points into making solid policy positions that say: okay, fine, if we are going to increase our debt ceiling, tell me why you are going to get there.

I come from the private sector. There are many times in my life I have had to go to lenders and tell them I need to borrow money. The first thing they would say is: give me your financials; let me look at the way you are running your company; let me see about what you are doing; then we will make a decision.

Then they would come back to me and say: you know what, I am looking at what you are asking for, and you definitely need an injection of capital; but my question is what is your turn-

around plan so you are not back here in 6 months or 12 months asking for more money on a failed model.

The people's House, the Congress, is made up of both Republicans and Democrats. More importantly, it is made up of Americans. We are looking at a year when the tax revenues are the highest they have ever been—\$3.25 trillion—yet, we continue to spend \$3.7 trillion to \$3.8 trillion.

Now people look at that and their eyes kind of roll back in their head. They say: I have absolutely no idea what you are talking about.

So you reduce it down to this, which I think is the most effective way of explaining it. Hardworking American couples sit down at the kitchen table. It is kitchen table economics. It is not all this other stuff. It is not all these hieroglyphics.

The husband and the wife talk and say: you know what, Honey, we had a great year; I was able to bring home \$32,500; what I want you to do is to go out and spend \$37,500 or \$38,000.

They would look at each other and say: wait a minute, you told me you had a great year—and you did—but you want me to spend even more money than you brought in.

We constantly tell the American people: you are going to have to tighten your belts; you are going to have to live within your means. And then, because we don't have to, we go out and borrow and raise the debt ceiling.

Think about that couple that is increasing their debt load year after year after year—deficit spending—and we are crowing about the fact that you know what, we have cut our deficit spending by half a trillion dollars this year. Aren't we doing well?

My question is: so where does that deficit spending go? It goes onto your long-term debt. You are digging the hole so deep that you will never be able to climb out of it, but you are feeling good about it because you were able to satisfy whatever your needs were at that moment.

That is not only irresponsible, it is unconscionable. More than that, it is immoral for people to sit in this House as representatives of the American people who have been given the authority to tax, but they have also been given the responsibility to spend that hardworking American taxpayer's dollar.

More importantly, once you have authority and once you have responsibility, you have got to be accountable not just to that person in the mirror, but, in my case, the 705,687 people that I represent in western Pennsylvania.

Now, they are not all Republicans. They are not all Democrats. They are not all Libertarians. They are not all Independents. But they are all hardworking American taxpayers.

Why do we have to reduce this down to a political-talking-points issue instead of talking about what is fundamentally sound economically?

You cannot spend your way out of debt. You cannot continue to borrow

irresponsibly and say: well, we have the power to do it. So when we ask the Secretary of the Treasury who else would you go to, that is who is responsible for it.

I don't care who is sitting in there. I don't care who is in the White House. I care about sound, fundamental fiscal policy that protects this country going forward, not only those that are with us right now, but those that came before us and those that are going to come after us.

We are putting ourselves in a position that is totally going to be unrecoverable. Why would we knowingly sit here and think if I can pin the blame on somebody else from the political opposite of me, I will somehow win an election?

Is it really that important to win an election and lose the country? Is it really that important to have a political talking point that makes you feel good about what you said so you can go back home to somebody and say: you saw what I did on the floor; right?

I would hope that the constituents would say: yes, I did. You just put me deeper in debt. You made it impossible for me to plan for my future. You made it impossible for us to remain one of the strongest countries in the world because debt will eliminate you. I don't care if it is a person. I don't care if it is a business. I don't care if it is a State or a country.

We are quickly approaching the point of no return. To sit here and try to make it a political battle instead of survival for the United States of America is totally irresponsible. More importantly, it is immoral.

This is not a political battle. This is a fight for the future of our country. This is a fight for sustainability in the greatest country the world has ever known.

I do not think that any of us should ever turn our back on our responsibility because it just wasn't politically right.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say I have the greatest respect for my colleague from Pennsylvania, but the reason why we oppose this is because it does nothing.

Actually, it attempts to pin the blame on the Secretary of the Treasury, but the reality is—and I want to repeat this for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—that Congress' decision on revenue and spending policies ultimately determine the level of debt and when the debt limit is reached. It is our responsibility.

What we object to is that, instead of debating concrete issues to reduce our deficit and reduce our debt, we are involved in this kind of debating a nonissue, a bill that does nothing, that will do nothing to reduce our deficit, reduce our debt, and is a complete waste of time.

At this point, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Massachusetts for his leadership.

I want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), whom I respect and admire, this isn't like a simple, homespun, sit around the kitchen table and work this out and be responsible in paying our bills. I wish it were.

That homespun couple in Pennsylvania or my district in Virginia can't start a war that is unpaid for in Iraq, can't decide to give wealthy people a tax cut that is unpaid for, can't run the U.S. economy into the ground that costs trillions of dollars in additional debt because of policy choices made in this Congress, not by the Secretary of the Treasury.

It was Republican Vice President Cheney who actually said in the midst of all of that that debts no longer matter.

So we are glad to see the new-found religion here on the floor of the House with our friends on the other side of the aisle, who are now once again concerned about debt, debt they helped accumulate to an obscene degree.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to not only that bill, but to the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act bill.

It comes as no surprise to my constituents in Virginia that the most anti-environmental Congress—the House majority is now attempting to tell the National Science Foundation how they ought to do and award Federal research grants based on what Congress deems worthy.

The House majority has been open about its climate denialism and candid about its outright political agenda against scientific fact. The very scientific community that we should trust to understand and forecast the effects of manmade global climate change is substituted in this bill by the United States Congress, a bunch of politicians.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem. It threatens the National Science Foundation's gold-standard merit-review process that has resulted in groundbreaking research over the years, including medical, technological, agricultural, and public health advancements.

Even worse, how are we to explain the majority's decision to exclude climate change, one of the most pressing global challenges we face, as one of the bill's seven national interest criteria? It is not even in there.

I offered an amendment that would have ensured climate change is deemed in the national interest. The Republican majority would not even allow that amendment to come to this floor for debate.

The NSF is helping to lead research in global climate change. For example, it was an NSF grant that launched a program in my district at George Mason University that will help television weather forecasters better inform and explain to viewers how climate change will affect us and those communities.

□ 1400

In 2013, Mr. Speaker, I visited a place called Ny-Alesund in Svalbard, Norway. This is the northernmost research installation in the planet in the Arctic Circle and a leading research and monitoring station that serves many of our international partners, including Norway, Italy, Japan, China, and the Netherlands.

I saw firsthand on that visit the rapid decline of Arctic sea ice and rapidly retreating glaciers. The research NSF funds there will have environmental and geopolitical benefits to the U.S., and we should be expanding not retracting on those commitments. I ask: How is it that research is not in the national interest?

This destructive bill will have a chilling effect on our research community, stifling ambitious research necessary to a 21st century future.

Sadly, once again, the Republican majority insists on misinformation and belief over empirical evidence and science.

I urge rejection of the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding, and I appreciate the chairman of the Rules Committee bringing this rule to the floor to allow for consideration of H.R. 3293, the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act.

H.R. 3293 requires each National Science Foundation public announcement of a grant award to be accompanied by a nontechnical explanation of the project's scientific merits and how it serves the national interest. This written justification affirms the National Science Foundation's determination that a project is worthy of taxpayer support based on scientific merit and national interest.

The bill sets forth that NSF grants should meet at least one of seven criteria that demonstrate a grant is in fact in the national interest. These national interest areas are in the original enabling legislation that established the National Science Foundation and its mission or are part of the National Science Foundation mission today. These criteria are:

Increased economic competitiveness in the United States;

Advancement of the health and welfare of the American public;

Development of an American STEM workforce that is globally competitive;

Increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology in the United States;

Increased partnerships between academia and industry in the United States;

Support for the national defense of the United States; or,

Promotion of the progress of science in the United States.

These seven national mission areas encompass the overriding needs of

America to which the scientific enterprise can contribute and advance. Under this umbrella, many scientific disciplines and research areas can and do receive support and flourish.

The amendments that were not made in order by the Rules Committee would have opened up this NSF national mission statement to include every pet project, earmark, or political point that Members on the other side could think of. In fact, the explicit, line item-directed subjects that Members wanted to add to the list of “what is in the national interest” are already covered by one of the seven categories in the bill.

We welcome a fair and open debate on the merits of the bill, and several amendments were made in order that allow us to have that debate. These include amendments by the ranking member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, as well as five other Democratic amendments.

This rule allows us to have that fair debate, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Every criticism I have heard in the last few minutes about this bill could be addressed if those who oppose the bill just took the time to read the bill. It is only three pages long. You can probably read it in 3 minutes. They would see that their opposition has no foundation whatsoever.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we can defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill that would help prevent mass shootings by promoting research on the causes of gun violence, making it easier to identify and treat those prone to committing these acts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I oppose both H.R. 3442 and H.R. 3293.

Again, on H.R. 3442, if we are serious about deficit and debt reduction, then we ought to be talking about substance and something real, not some sound bite where Members of the House can point to the administration to say it is all their fault.

The reality is, it really is the fault of all of us, when you come down to it, because this is the place where spending decisions are made, where tax policy is made.

If my colleagues do not want to raise the debt ceiling, then don't accumulate

all these bills. It is Congress that does this. When you accumulate all these bills and you have to raise the debt ceiling, it is irresponsible to all of a sudden say that we don't want to do it and then to default on our debt.

As I mentioned before, back in 2013, when Republican extremism actually shut the government down, it cost our economy \$24 billion and 120,000 jobs.

Now, \$24 billion may not seem like a lot to my Republican friends, but I assure you that it all starts to add up. Those 120,000 jobs that were lost is all lost revenue coming into the government which would go to paying down our deficit and debt.

If you really want to deal with this issue, then let's talk about things like paying for these wars that no one seems to want to pay for. Let's talk about not enacting tax breaks and tax cuts for wealthy individuals and not paying for it. Let's talk about reeling in some of these excessive subsidies to Big Oil and to other big corporate interests in this country. Let's talk about passing comprehensive immigration reform, which, again, the CBO has said would save us hundreds of billions of dollars that we could put toward getting our fiscal house in order.

Those are real things. This is just talk for the sake of talk. I guess maybe it is a good press release; but, quite frankly, I think our time would be better spent doing something else.

Again, on H.R. 3293, the so-called Scientific Research in the National Interest Act, I take great exception to those who question the integrity of the NSF. The National Science Foundation has integrity, in my opinion, beyond question. The work that they do is extraordinary. The work that they do leads to all kinds of benefits not only for the people in this country, but for the environment and people all over the world.

I think the scientists who work there are having their reputations questioned by the introduction of this legislation, never mind us even considering it here today. I think you are diminishing the incredible work that they do.

I get it. For some reason, my Republican colleagues can't admit that we have a thing called climate change going on around the world. So any time anybody talks about climate change, you go after whatever department or agency it is. You attack them. You try to cut their funding. You try to question their integrity.

Well, I hate to tell my Republican friends that climate change is real. The overwhelming science says it is real. If you don't appreciate that, maybe you ought to go back to school and take a science class.

When we talk about the lack of accountability and the lack of proper stewardship of what we are supposed to be doing here, that is one area where I think we have let the American people down; indeed, the world community.

We are sitting here debating whether it is even an issue—which the Amer-

ican people can't believe—while things continue to get worse.

I would say to my Republican friends: admit it; climate change is for real. You are on the wrong side of public opinion. When you try to claim it is a hoax, you are on the wrong side of the scientific community and you are on the wrong side of history.

One final thing, because I couldn't help but take note that my colleague from Texas kind of took a jab at Massachusetts over home heating oil. I would say to the gentleman a couple of things. One, Massachusetts is leading the Nation in terms of investments in renewable and green energy. I am really proud of what my State is doing.

I would say one other thing to the gentleman from Texas, and that is that his State—Texas—generates 10 times more emissions from heating oil, compared to Massachusetts. So I would urge him to get his State's emissions under control for the sake of our planet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The first thing I would like to say to the gentleman is that Texas is bigger than France and Texas is bigger than Massachusetts. In fact, we have economic output. We have lots of people working. We have economic prowess in Texas.

We do have more output of what might be carbon. We do. We also had \$290 billion worth of economic activity that we sent overseas. Texas helps the United States of America float its boat because we have jobs, we have lower taxes, we have great schools, we have people that enjoy living where they live, and we have people that take responsibility.

Across the board, Texas is a great place to live. Texas does, as you have heard many times, move our country in a direction to more freedom, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about is freedom. With that freedom comes responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, why we are here today—exactly as I started to say in the very beginning—is that our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, has challenged I think all of Congress, but in particular this Republican majority, to bring forth good ideas that address the issues, thoughts, and answers about the problems that the United States Congress perhaps is responsible for and perhaps the United States sees that we need to start talking about what our future is going to be.

When he was the chairman of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, Speaker RYAN talked about growing our economy. I know our friends want to raise taxes. I know the President of the United

States wants to also, now that the energy costs are down, stick them back up and stick the American people with a \$10 a barrel tax. I know that what they want is more and more and more spending. They will get their chance with the budget when it comes in a trillion dollars higher in a year than what we are spending right now. That is their vision.

What we are talking about today is our vision, Speaker RYAN's vision, and the Republican majority's vision. And what is that? We would like to put in place an agreement. We would like for it to be a bipartisan vote. We already have bipartisan support. And that is so that we could say that, regardless of who is President and Secretary of the Treasury—right now, I don't know who it is going to be; I really couldn't even guess—we, as a body, make sure that we are focusing on what this is going to look like at the time. The gentleman from Massachusetts was very clear to say we already know all these things, but we don't.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague to support this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 609 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3926) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for better understanding of the epidemic of gun violence, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3926.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 609, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4470.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]
YEAS—237

Abraham	Grothman	Peterson
Aderholt	Guinta	Pittenger
Allen	Guthrie	Pitts
Amash	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Amodel	Harper	Poliquin
Babin	Harris	Pompeo
Barletta	Hartzler	Posey
Barr	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Barton	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Benishek	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bilirakis	Hill	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Black	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hunter	Rigell
Blum	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Bost	Hurt (VA)	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jones	Roskam
Buck	Jordan	Ross
Bucshon	Joyce	Rothfus
Burgess	Katko	Rouzer
Byrne	Kelly (MS)	Royce
Calvert	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Salmon
Carter (TX)	King (NY)	Sanford
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kline	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cole	LaHood	Sessions
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shuster
Comstock	Lance	Simpson
Conaway	Latta	Smith (MO)
Cook	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Love	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stewart
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Lummis	Stutzman
Davis, Rodney	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Marchant	Thornberry
Dent	Marino	Tiberi
DeSantis	Massie	Tipton
DesJarlais	McCarthy	Trott
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Turner
Dold	McClintock	Upton
Donovan	McHenry	Valadao
Duffy	McKinley	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Rodgers	Walden
Ellmers (NC)	McSally	Walker
Emmer (MN)	Meadows	Walorski
Farenthold	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Fitzpatrick	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Mica	Webster (FL)
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Flores	Miller (MI)	Westerman
Forbes	Moolenaar	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Fox	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Womack
Garrett	Newhouse	Woodall
Gibbs	Noem	Yoder
Gibson	Nugent	Yoho
Gohmert	Nunes	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Olson	Young (IA)
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Granger	Palmer	Zeldin
Graves (LA)	Paulsen	Zinke
Graves (MO)	Pearce	
Griffith	Perry	

NAYS—180

Adams	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Aguilar	Becerra	Blumenauer
Ashford	Bera	Bonamici
Bass	Beyer	

Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al

NOT VOTING—16

Castro (TX)
 Duckworth
 Fincher
 Gowdy
 Graves (GA)
 Hanna

Herrera Beutler
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Kelly (IL)
 Mullin
 Quigley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1434

So the previous question was ordered.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]
 AYES—236

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Bustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Katko
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Huelskamp
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Palusen

DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Price (NC)
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster

Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis

Price (NC)
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aguilar
 Castro (TX)
 DeLauro
 Duckworth
 Fincher
 Gowdy
 Graves (GA)

Hanna
 Herrera Beutler
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Kelly (IL)
 LaMalfa
 Mullin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1440

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
 Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 66, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT IMPROVED COMPLIANCE AWARENESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4470) to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act with respect to the requirements related to lead in drinking water, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

Adams
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos

Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn

Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DelBene

NOES—178

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—416

Abraham	DeFazio	Jeffries
Adams	DeGette	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	Delaney	Jenkins (WV)
Aguilar	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Allen	DelBene	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Denham	Johnson, E. B.
Amodei	Dent	Johnson, Sam
Ashford	DeSantis	Jolly
Babin	DeSaulnier	Jones
Barletta	DesJarlais	Jordan
Barr	Deutch	Joyce
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Kaptur
Bass	Dingell	Katko
Beatty	Doggett	Keating
Becerra	Dold	Kelly (MS)
Benishkek	Donovan	Kelly (PA)
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Beyer	F.	Kildee
Bilirakis	Duffy	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Kind
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Edwards	King (NY)
Black	Ellison	Kinzinger (IL)
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Kirkpatrick
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Kline
Blumenauer	Engel	Knight
Bonamici	Eshoo	Kuster
Bost	Esty	Labrador
Boustany	Farenthold	LaHood
Boyle, Brendan	Farr	LaMalfa
F.	Fattah	Lamborn
Brady (PA)	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Langevin
Brat	Fleming	Larsen (WA)
Bridenstine	Flores	Larson (CT)
Brooks (AL)	Forbes	Latta
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Lawrence
Brown (FL)	Foster	Lee
Brownley (CA)	Foxx	Levin
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Buck	Franks (AZ)	Lieu, Ted
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Burgess	Fudge	LoBiondo
Bustos	Gabbard	Loebsack
Butterfield	Gallego	Lofgren
Byrne	Garamendi	Long
Calvert	Garrett	Loudermilk
Capps	Gibbs	Love
Capuano	Gibson	Lowenthal
Cárdenas	Gohmert	Lowey
Carney	Goodlatte	Lucas
Carson (IN)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Carter (GA)	Graham	Lujan Grisham
Carter (TX)	Granger	(NM)
Cartwright	Graves (LA)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Castor (FL)	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Chabot	Grayson	Lummis
Chaffetz	Green, Al	Lynch
Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	MacArthur
Ciilline	Griffith	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Carolyn
Clarke (NY)	Grothman	Maloney, Sean
Clawson (FL)	Guinta	Marchant
Clay	Guthrie	Marino
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clyburn	Hahn	McCarthy
Coffman	Hardy	McCaul
Cohen	Harper	McClintock
Cole	Harris	McCollum
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	McDermott
Collins (NY)	Hastings	McGovern
Comstock	Heck (NV)	McHenry
Conaway	Heck (WA)	McKinley
Connolly	Hensarling	McMorris
Conyers	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers
Cook	Higgins	McNerney
Cooper	Hill	McSally
Costa	Himes	Meadows
Costello (PA)	Hinojosa	Meehan
Courtney	Holding	Meeks
Cramer	Honda	Meng
Crawford	Hoyer	Messer
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Mica
Crowley	Huffman	Miller (FL)
Cuellar	Hultgren	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Hunter	Moolenaar
Cummings	Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)
Curbelo (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Moore
Davis (CA)	Israel	Moulton
Davis, Danny	Issa	Mulvaney
Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)

Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Nadler	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Napolitano	Roskam	Tiberi
Neal	Ross	Tipton
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Titus
Newhouse	Rouzer	Tonko
Noem	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Nolan	Royce	Trott
Norcross	Ruiz	Tsongas
Nugent	Ruppersberger	Turner
Nunes	Rush	Upton
O'Rourke	Russell	Valadao
Olson	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Palazzo	Salmon	Vargas
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Veasey
Palmer	T.	Vela
Pascarell	Sanford	Velázquez
Paulsen	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Payne	Scalise	Wagner
Pearce	Schakowsky	Walberg
Pelosi	Schiff	Walden
Perlmutter	Schrader	Walker
Perry	Schweikert	Walorski
Peters	Scott (VA)	Walters, Mimi
Peterson	Scott, Austin	Walz
Pingree	Scott, David	Wasserman
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Schultz
Pitts	Serrano	Waters, Maxine
Pocan	Sessions	Watson Coleman
Poe (TX)	Sewell (AL)	Weber (TX)
Poliquin	Sherman	Webster (FL)
Polis	Shimkus	Welch
Pompeo	Shuster	Wenstrup
Posey	Simpson	Westerman
Price (NC)	Sinema	Whitfield
Price, Tom	Sires	Williams
Rangel	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Ratcliffe	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Reed	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Renacci	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Ribble	Speier	Yarmuth
Rice (NY)	Stefanik	Yoder
Rice (SC)	Stewart	Yoho
Richmond	Stivers	Young (AK)
Rigell	Stutzman	Young (IA)
Roby	Swalwell (CA)	Young (IN)
Roe (TN)	Takai	Zeldin
Rogers (AL)	Takano	Zinke
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)	
Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)	

NAYS—2

Massie	Rokita
Castro (TX)	Hanna
Duckworth	Herrera Beutler
Fincher	Hudson
Gowdy	Huizenga (MI)
Graves (GA)	Kelly (IL)
Mullin	Quigley
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)
Westmoreland	

NOT VOTING—15

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1447

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 67 on H.R. 4470, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today to attend the funeral of a family member.

Had I been present, on rollcall No. 65, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 66, I would have voted "yes," and on rollcall No. 67, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 65 on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question

on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 3293 and H.R. 3442. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 66 on H. Res. 609—Rule Providing for consideration of both H.R. 3293—Scientific Research in the National Interest Act and H.R. 3442—Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 67 on H.R. 4470—Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3293.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 609 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3293.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1448

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3293) to provide for greater accountability in Federal funding for scientific research, to promote the progress of science in the United States that serves that national interest, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3293, the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act, is a bipartisan bill that ensures the grant process at the National Science Foundation is transparent and accountable to the American people.

America's future economic growth and national security depend on innovation. Public and private investments in research and development fuel the economy, create jobs, and lead to new technologies that benefit Americans' daily lives.

Unfortunately, in recent years, the Federal Government has awarded too many grants that few Americans would consider to be in the national interest.

For example, the National Science Foundation awarded \$700,000 of taxpayer money to support a climate change-themed musical that quickly closed and almost \$1 million for a social media project that targeted Americans' online political speech.

A few other examples of questionable grants include: \$487,000 to study the Icelandic textile industry during the Viking era; \$340,000 to study early human-set fires in New Zealand; \$233,000 to study ancient Mayan architecture and their salt industry; and \$220,000 to study animal photos in National Geographic magazine.

When the NSF funds such projects as these, there is less money to support worthwhile scientific research that keeps our country on the forefront of innovation. Such areas include: computer science, advanced materials, lasers, telecommunications, information technology, development of new medicines, nanotechnology, cybersecurity, and dozens of others that hold the greatest promise of revolutionary scientific breakthroughs. These sectors can create millions of new jobs and transform society in positive ways.

NSF invests about \$6 billion a year of taxpayer funds on research projects and related activities.

The 1950 enabling legislation that created the NSF set forth the Foundation's mission and cited the "national interest" as the foundation for public support and dissemination of basic scientific research.

The Science in the National Interest Act reaffirms and restores this crucial mission. This will add transparency, accountability, and credibility to the NSF and its grant process.

H.R. 3293 requires NSF grants to meet at least one of seven criteria that demonstrates it is in the national interest. These seven criteria are: increased economic competitiveness in the United States; advancement of the health and welfare of the American public; development of an American STEM workforce that is globally competitive; increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology in the United States; increased partnerships between academia and industry in the United States; support for the national defense of the United States; and promotion of the progress of science in the United States.

Both the National Science Foundation director and the National Science Board have endorsed the principle that NSF should be more accountable in its grant funding decisions.

To NSF Director France Cordova's credit, the NSF began to implement new internal policies last year that acknowledge the need for NSF to communicate clearly and in nontechnical terms the research projects it funds and how they are in the national interest.

Opponents of this bill must think they know better than the NSF director. Director Cordova testified before the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee that the policy in H.R. 3293 is compatible with the NSF's internal guidelines. This legislation makes that commitment clear, explicit, and permanent.

Today, the NSF funds only one out of five proposals submitted by our scientists and research institutions.

How do we assure hardworking American families that their tax dollars are spent only on high priority research when we spend \$700,000 of their money on a short-lived climate change-themed musical? It is not Congress' money, it is the taxpayers'.

How could elected representatives not agree that we owe it to American taxpayers and the scientific community to ensure that every grant funded is worthy and in the national interest?

With a national debt that now exceeds \$19 trillion and continues to climb by hundreds of billions of dollars each year, we cannot fund every worthy proposal, much less frivolous ones like a climate change musical.

The legislation before us reaffirms in law that every NSF grant must support research that is demonstrably in the national interest.

Scientists still make the decisions. They just do not get a blank check signed by the taxpayer. They need to be accountable to the American people by showing their proposals are, in fact, in the national interest.

H.R. 3293 passed the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee in October by a voice vote.

Congress has a responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and are focused on national priorities. This bill is an essential step to restore and maintain taxpayer support for basic scientific research.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3293, the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act.

I oppose this bill because I believe that this bill will hurt the Nation's premier basic research agency, lead to less high reward research, and, ultimately, leave America less competitive.

My Republican colleagues have a simple argument for their legislation:

Shouldn't NSF research be in the national interest? That is a very good question, but one that can be easily answered.

My answer is that NSF research is already in the national interest. It has been for more than 60 years.

The Federal investment in basic research over the past 60 years has been the primary driver of our Nation's economic growth and innovation. In innumerable ways, our investments in basic research have paid back a wealth of dividends.

This fact is widely recognized across academia and industry. The National Academies' "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report made this point a decade ago. That panel, chaired by the former head of Lockheed-Martin, understood that investment in basic research was fundamentally in the national interest.

When we passed the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 as part of the Democrats' innovation agenda, that bill was endorsed by hundreds of business and research organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. They all understood that investment in basic research is in the national interest.

What is this bill really about? Is it really about enhancing our Nation's ability to innovate? No. Sadly, this bill continues the Republican majority's preoccupation with second-guessing America's best and brightest research scientists.

For the past 3 years, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology majority has been engaged in a relentless and pernicious campaign against research grants with silly or odd sounding titles.

Republicans have used that time to carry out an unprecedented rifling through the 70 NSF grants reviews. After all this effort, did they find any evidence of wrongdoing? No. The only thing they found was what they already knew: each of the research grants had passed NSF's merit review process with flying colors.

The majority may not like it and wish the results were different, but those are the facts. Let me be clear. Some of the greatest scientific achievements of the past 60 years were the result of funny sounding research, including research that was ridiculed in Congress as frivolous.

There are scores of examples. One of my favorites is "The Sex Life of the Screwworm," surely one of the silliest sounding titles for research there could possibly be. So silly, in fact, that in the 1970s, the grant was ridiculed as an example of government waste on the Senate floor. Sounds a lot like what the majority is doing here today.

It turned out that the screwworm was costing the U.S. cattle industry a small fortune. As a direct result of this silly sounding research, the cattle industry saved approximately \$20 billion in the U.S. and significantly reduced the cost of beef to U.S. consumers.

□ 1500

At its core, this bill is about second-guessing our Nation's best and brightest scientists and the grant-making decisions they make.

Perhaps this is not surprising when so many of my Republican colleagues openly question the validity of whole fields of established science, from the social sciences to climate science to evolutionary biology.

Far from adding anything useful to the NSF's review process, H.R. 3293 would add more bureaucracy and paperwork. Yet, my biggest concern about these requirements is that they will push NSF reviewers to fund less high-risk research, which, by its very nature, entails the pursuit of scientific understanding without it necessarily having any particular or known benefit. We know that high-risk research tends to have the highest reward, something that we have seen throughout the history of the NSF.

I am not alone in my concerns. The President's science adviser, Dr. John Holdren, noted:

H.R. 3293 would create doubt at NSF and in the research community about Congress' real intent in calling into question the adequacy of NSF's gold standard merit-review process for applied as well as for basic research.

This could easily have a chilling effect on the amount of basic research that scientists propose and that NSF chooses to fund, with detrimental consequences for this Nation's leadership in science, technology, and innovation alike.

Mr. Chair, I choose to stand with the scientists when it comes to science. For that reason, I strongly oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say to the gentlewoman from Texas that her objections are simply too late. They are too late because the Director of the National Science Foundation has already incorporated the national interest standard into the current guidelines that are being used at the National Science Foundation. We are already using that, and the bill makes them permanent.

I do like the gentlewoman's example of a screwworm because that is a reason to vote for the bill and not to oppose the bill. One of the requirements in the bill is that these grants be explained in plain English so that we know their connection to the national interest. Clearly, there would be no problem in explaining why the example she gave is connected to the national interest.

In a few minutes, I will give just a few more examples of how taxpayers' money is currently being used and should not be used.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank Chairman SMITH for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3293, Scientific Research in the National Interest Act.

The NSF invests about \$6 billion of public funds each year on research projects and related activities. It is the only Federal agency that is dedicated to the support of fundamental research and education in all scientific and engineering disciplines.

Since its creation in 1950, the NSF has served a mission that helps make the United States a world leader in science and innovation. In recent years, however, the NSF has seemed to stray away from its created purpose and has funded a number of grants that few Americans would consider in the national interest.

H.R. 3293 seeks to restore the NSF's critical mission by requiring the NSF to explain in writing and in non-technical language how each research grant awarded supports the national interest and is worthy of Federal funding.

Now, think about that for a moment: not just explaining it in scientific terms that the fellow scientific community can understand, but also in terms that taxpayers can understand.

In a time of distrust and suspicion of the Federal Government and of all institutions, that is a very important key point, being able to explain to the folks back home why it matters.

The bill also sets forth that NSF grants should meet one of seven criteria that demonstrates the grant is in the national interest.

Today, as was noted by the chairman, the NSF is able to fund only one out of every five proposals. This is a critical bill to restore faith in the process. We need to pass this.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose this bill.

America is an exceptional nation. One of the reasons we are the best country in the world is that we believe in science and we believe in innovation. Our country has always believed in physics and in chemistry, and we trust scientists.

The National Science Foundation has helped this country grow in terms of innovation and in terms of amazing scientific discoveries. It is not broken. So why are we trying to meddle with what the scientists have done?

The chairman mentioned some examples of grants that sounded sort of funny. I understand that most of the Republican legislators do not believe in climate change, but the overwhelming majority of scientists do, as does the U.S. military, as does ExxonMobil today.

One of the grants had to do with how people learn about climate change. That is vitally important because climate change is going to affect our children and our grandchildren.

It is true that some of these grants sound funny. That is because scientists

do all sorts of things that, to a layperson, may not be very obvious.

Because I am not a scientist and because most people are not scientists, I think that is perfectly fine, that we don't have all sorts of redundant writings that explain what an experiment does. Let me give you one example that is on the NSF's Web site.

One of the grants is to study funny-looking colored clay in France, blue-green clay in another country. It sounds like a really silly grant, doesn't it?

It turns out that, when they looked at it, there were properties in this blue-green clay in France that kill bacteria, anti-bacterial properties that can help deal with MRSA, that can help deal with superbugs. This can be a groundbreaking grant, a groundbreaking discovery, but under this bill, it might have problems being funded.

Ultimately, what this is really about and what I have learned now in Congress is that often we are very arrogant. We do not trust scientists. We do not trust the people in America.

This is an arrogant bill that sort of says we know best, not the scientists who are doing peer reviews of what grants to fund, and that we know which experiment might do exactly what.

It turns out, in science, lots of times scientists study one area and get a completely different, amazing discovery in a totally unrelated area. We need to fund basic science. We need to take our hands off this. We need to trust scientists and trust the people in America.

Do not pass this bill. We are not that arrogant. We should not determine what scientists are to be doing and that we know better than they do, because we do not. I ask for opposition to this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I really wish the people who say they oppose this bill would actually read the bill. It is only three pages long. They can probably read it in 3 minutes. Let me read the last sentence of the bill itself.

"Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the Foundation's intellectual merit or broader impacts criteria for evaluating grant applications."

Despite what just might have been told, we don't interfere with the merit-review process whatsoever.

The other thing is, when you come up with an example, as the gentleman just gave, it is clearly in the national interest. All we are asking is that the explanation show why it is in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), who is the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman, for

yielding this time and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, last month the Congressional Budget Office released an updated deficit projection for fiscal year 2016. The CBO now expects that our deficit will be \$544 billion this year, which is an increase from the original projection of \$414 billion.

Now, more than ever, Congress needs to work diligently to reduce spending and balance the Federal budget. However, it is equally important for us to make sure that every taxpayer dollar that is spent is used responsibly.

That is why I am an original cosponsor of the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act. It will help ensure that the National Science Foundation, one of our Nation's most critical research agencies, is using its funding in the most beneficial way possible.

This bill requires the NSF to explain how each of its grants further America's best interests. This could be done through advancing STEM education, national defense, economic competitiveness, public health, or other key priorities.

By requiring the NSF to justify its research, this bill will help crack down on frivolous government programs. And, yes, Mr. Chairman, there are frivolous government programs.

For example, the NSF is currently spending \$374,000 of taxpayer money on a study of the ups and downs of senior citizens' dating experiences. While we all want, I am sure, Americans to enjoy their romantic lives throughout the year, we cannot afford this type of wasteful taxpayer spending when we have a \$19 trillion debt.

This commonsense legislation will ensure that NSF research is well directed and that it will help prevent valuable taxpayer dollars from being wasted.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this bill, which represents an effort by politicians to overrule expert scientists in deciding which scientific grants the NSF should fund.

In defense of their misguided effort, some of my colleagues like to pick a grant and poke fun at it or trivialize it or simply state that, in their opinion, it is not worth funding.

One of the grants that has been singled out is entitled Participant Support for the Zero Emissions Category of the Clean Snowmobile Challenge.

Snowmobiles are ideal modes of transportation in extreme polar locations. This grant funded the Clean Snowmobile Challenge in which students formed teams to engineer a lower emissions snowmobile.

Engineering competitions are both an important proving ground for new

technologies and an incredible opportunity for students to engage in real-world engineering challenges.

My colleagues frequently talk up the importance of STEM competitions. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has held entire full committee hearings on that very topic. Now some of my same colleagues would ridicule an engineering competition just because it might have a climate change benefit.

I hope all of my colleagues here today agree with me that encouraging and, certainly, promoting our next generation of engineers is definitely in the national interest, even when it results in less pollution.

This grant, singled out for ridicule by some in the majority, is just another example of why we should be concerned about the intent of this legislation.

I would also like to point out that I strongly believe that the current gold standard merit-review process works and that we should not be politicizing science.

The sheer number of amendments to this legislation demonstrates the flawed methodology of trying to define which research is in the national interest.

I think all of the Members who offered amendments to this section would agree that important priorities have been left out. Personally, I believe we have unacceptably overlooked clean drinking water and climate change.

I offered an amendment with Congressman KILDEE that would expand the priority of advancement of health and welfare to include clean drinking water explicitly. Unfortunately, this amendment was not made in order.

As we have seen in the news recently out of Flint, Michigan, we have taken our drinking water infrastructure for granted for decades. This neglect and lack of investment has caused serious public health issues.

We need to invest more, but we should not invest in a 20th or, in some cases, in a 19th century drinking water system.

A 21st century economy requires a 21st century infrastructure, but that cannot happen unless it is coupled with the critical research that will help us improve the construction, the operation, and the maintenance of our water systems. Our Nation's future public health and economic development are counting on it.

Clean drinking water is one of many important priorities not listed in this legislation. However, beyond missing important priorities, I am concerned that this legislation will limit critical research.

The exciting part of research is that, at the start, we do not know what we will find; so, we cannot accurately predict ahead of time all of the implications the research will have on specific national priorities. Instead, we should invest and encourage high-risk, high-reward research.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

□ 1515

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Here are some more reasons why we need this bill, and these are some more examples of how taxpayers' dollars have been spent: \$200,000 to tour Europe for an overview of the Turkish fashion veil industry; \$1.5 million to study pasture management in Mongolia; \$735,000 for the American Bar Association to follow young lawyers' careers; \$920,000 to study textile making in Iceland during the Viking era; \$164,000 to study Chinese immigration to Italy in 1900.

There are dozens and dozens of more examples.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) who is the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Chairman SMITH's bill, H.R. 3293. At a time when budget constraints and the deficit loom large and ominous, why in the world would anyone object to more transparency and accountability? Can anyone explain that to me? I didn't think so.

Here is how some of our hardworking taxpayer money is being spent.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list of 41 studies and programs that, if taxpayers knew, they would rise up and revolt.

Some of the more notable are:

\$227,000 to review animal photos in National Geographic magazine. (what baboon thought that up?)

\$350,000 to study human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s. (the main "human set fire" here is our taxpayer dollars being burned)

\$200,000 to tour Europe for an overview of the Turkish fashion-veil industry. (I am reminded that fashion is a form of ugliness so bad, it has to be changed about every 6 months!)

\$735,000 for the American Bar Association to follow young lawyers' careers (3 awards).

\$920,000 to study textile-making in Iceland during the Viking era (2 awards).

\$50,000 to support STEM education in Sri Lanka.

\$164,000 to study Chinese immigration to Italy (1900 to present).

\$20,000 to study stress among people from lowland Bolivia (one of 12 awards).

\$147,000 to analyze fishing practices at Lake Victoria, Africa. (Heck: all you gotta do is come down to my district in Galveston TX and we'll show you how to analyze fishing practices for a lot less and you can spend that money in our country!)

\$147,000 to study international marriages between citizens of France and Madagascar.

\$50,000 to study civil lawsuits in colonial Peru (1600–1700 AD).

\$250,000 to survey public attitudes about the Senate filibuster rule.

\$300,000 to study law firms in Silicon Valley.

\$170,000 to study basket weaving among Alaskan native peoples (2 awards). Perhaps that's what folks think Congress is majoring in.

\$276,000 to study the pre-history of Chiapas, Mexico.

\$246,000 to study migration and adoption between Peru and Spain.

\$134,000 to study Late Bronze Age metalurgy in the Southern Urals, Russia.

\$195,000 to contrast the histories of Patagonian and Amazonian national parks.

\$281,000 to analyze the history of Izapa, Mexico.

\$136,000 to study life/history transitions among indigenous people of northern Argentina.

\$27,000 to study Mayan wooden architecture and salt industry (600–900 AD).

\$92,000 to study Mexico's public vehicle registration system.

\$373,000 to study Chinese kinship, women's labor and economy (1600–2000 AD).

\$152,000 to analyze accountability and transparency in China's dairy industry.

\$300,000 to study Cyprus during the Bronze Age (2 awards).

\$226,000 to study cultural dynamics in western Turkey.

\$119,000 to coordinate an international archaeological project in the S. American Andes.

\$300,000 to produce an experimental dance program about nature and physics.

\$516,000 to help amateurs create a video game—"Relive Prom Night."

\$200,000 to devise social media algorithms for "Truthy.com," a website aimed at censoring political speech by Tea Party members, conservatives, etc.

\$605,000 to travel and study why people around the world cheat on their taxes.

\$193,000 to study human fish consumption in Tanzania (300–1500 AD).

\$221,000 to study use of ochre pigment for painting in Stone Age Kenya.

\$101,000 to pay for American psychologists to international conferences.

\$250,000 to educate local TV meteorologists about climate change (2 awards).

\$38,000 to consider whether livestock herding families in rural, undeveloped areas have more children in response to herd growth, or if increased family size drives herd growth.

\$193,000 to study human fish consumption in Tanzania (1300–1500 AD).

\$38,000 to study prehistoric rabbit hunting on the Iberian Peninsula.

\$1.8 million to study the potential of commercial fish farming at Lake Victoria, Africa.

\$330,000 to study the careers of 2,500 new lawyers in Russia.

\$1.5 million to study pasture management in Mongolia.

Mr. Chairman, some of the more notable are:

\$227,000 to review animal photos in National Geographic magazine. What baboon thought that up?

\$350,000 to study human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s. The only thing being set on fire here is taxpayers' dollars.

\$200,000 to tour Europe for an overview of the Turkish fashion veil industry. I am reminded what a friend of mine says. He says fashion is a form of ugliness so bad that we have to change it every 6 months, and yet we want to study it over in another country.

\$147,000 to analyze fishing practices at Lake Victoria, Africa. Heck, folks, if y'all come on down to Galveston, Texas, we will show y'all how to fish

and analyze that, and you can spend money in our country.

\$170,000 to study basket weaving among Alaskan Native peoples. Is it any wonder that most of Americans think Congress must major in basket weaving?

These are just some of the more notable ones, Mr. Chairman. I could go on through the 41 on the list. For example, \$330,000 to study the careers of 2,500 new lawyers in Russia. It is not that we don't have enough lawyers over here in America; now we are concerned about the ones in Russia.

I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman. I just want to simply say, I urge my colleagues to support transparency and accountability on behalf of our constituents and taxpayers. After all, they are paying the freight for this stuff. Shouldn't we be open and accountable to them?

I commend Chairman SMITH for his bill and for putting hardworking tax-paying Americans first.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I rise to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 3293, the legislation of my friend, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, the so-called Scientific Research in the National Interest Act.

I understand the genesis of this bill: Mr. SMITH's dismay at some of the titles of the National Science Foundation's funded research.

This bill is the wrong approach to addressing the very occasional misuse of NSF grants, and it represents classic short-term thinking.

I am a businessman, and I know of no one in the business community who wants politicians or government to decide business winners or losers.

Of course, none of us, Democrat or Republican, believe that politicians should be making science decisions either. I believe Representative BILL FOSTER is the only Ph.D. scientist in the House, and the rest of us don't qualify.

By proclaiming the seven definitions of what science is in the national interest, we politicians are, in fact, deciding what is worthy of scientific research. By the way, no one on this side yet has raised any objections to the transparency or the accountability of the National Science Foundation. That completely mischaracterizes our objections.

These standards sound constructive and benign—increased economic activity, advancement of health and welfare, support for the national defense, et cetera—but only one of the seven definitions even mentions science. The last one says for the "promotion of the progress of science for the United States," whatever that means.

Where, oh, where is the commitment to basic research, the kind of fundamental research that I know all of us value?

Listen to all the funny names that would have sounded especially funny at

the time: Would Einstein's 1905 papers on special relativity, on the photoelectric effect, and on Brownian motion even qualify under the seven definitions? How about Niels Bohr's research on quantum mechanics? How about Murray Gell-Mans' work on particle physics in quarks? How about Rosalind Franklin's work on the crystallography of DNA?

My college roommate spent 4 years at Berkeley, 1972 to 1976, studying something called Roman spectroscopy. He had no idea what it would do. Today we call them MRIs.

That is the whole point of basic research. We don't know where it will lead. We don't know that it is in the national interest. It just adds to our knowledge.

On the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we reveled in the NASA presentation of the Pluto photographs. How does our New Horizons mission to Pluto possibly qualify under the seven definitions of the national interest?

I respect that the chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee wants the NSF funds expended into legitimate scientific research. I agree. Mr. SMITH used the phrase "demonstrably in the national interest." How could we definitely know, when all of basic research is, by definition, long term rather than short term?

Let's let the scientists decide and oppose this well-meaning but ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

To those who are on the other side, I really again encourage them to read the bill. It is three pages long. There is nothing in the bill that says we are going to tell the scientists what to do or think. It is very clear, in the examples that the gentleman just gave, that all of those are connected to the national interest. If a scientist can't explain that, then there are greater problems than we might expect.

The other point is, to repeat what I said a while ago, if you oppose the national interest standard, you are too late. The National Science Foundation Director has incorporated the national interest standard in the current guidelines. If you want to oppose the bill because you don't want to make the standard permanent, that is your prerogative, but don't oppose the national interest standard that is in the current guidelines.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who is an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to start where we all have agreement. I think everyone would acknowledge that they want research funded by the NSF to be in the Nation's interest. We agree the Nation's interest is furthered by promoting scientific progress. That is certainly one of the principal reasons that I have served on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for 12 years.

We also have some disagreements. I have respectfully disagreed with the chairman over his criticisms of some NSF grants. At a hearing in November of 2013, I spoke out strongly against a very different NSF bill, and I believe some people are confusing that bill with this bill that we have here today.

If you read this bill's text, I don't believe you can find anything that could undermine the merit review process at the NSF. In fact, I think this bill will help protect the NSF from future attacks and make the Foundation stronger.

H.R. 3293 says research funded by the NSF must be worthy of Federal funding and in the national interest. The national interest is defined by a series of broad criteria, one of which is that a grant have the potential to promote "the progress of science for the United States." It is difficult to conceive of research that would be recommended by an NSF peer review panel that would not meet that standard. Thus, it is difficult for me to see how this standard could harm the work that the Foundation does.

The bill clearly states that it is the job of the Foundation to determine what is worthy of funding, not politicians, and that nothing in the bill would alter NSF's blunted peer review process, which we agree is the gold standard for funding scientific research. As a scientist myself, I believe this is as it should be.

Nevertheless, there have been suggestions that this bill is politicians creating a political filter on what research should be funded, but it is striking how similar this language is to the broader impacts criterion that we advanced in a bipartisan fashion in the 2010 COMPETES Reauthorization Act. There was no concern at the time about that language being a political filter, nor was there any concern that broader impacts be applied to a portfolio of grants, rather than individual awards.

Furthermore, at the time, the Foundation already had broader impact criterion as part of their review process, yet this committee still acted to put the criteria in statute. And the ease with which NSF has implemented the broader impacts criteria suggests to me that they could implement this language without changing the nature of the research they fund.

There is some concern that this bill would cause the Foundation to become more risk averse or applied, not funding breakthrough grants like the one that started Google. So let's take a look at that grant.

The NSF funded the Stanford Integrated Digital Library Project in 1994, and the research conducted through that grant, as well as other private and public support, including a graduate research fellowship for Sergey Brin, led to the algorithms that were the intellectual basis of Google.

The purpose of that grant, as stated in the abstract, was "to develop the enabling technologies for a single, inte-

grated and 'universal' library, proving uniform access to the large number of emerging networked information sources and collections." Even putting aside the emerging collections on the Web that could be impacted, that grant clearly seemed to have the potential to promote the progress of computer science and be worthy of Federal funding and, thus, would have been funded under the provisions of this bill.

Indeed, the debate around this bill has focused less on the language in the bill and more on the concern of intentions behind the bill. As I have said, I have disagreed with recent criticisms of the NSF. Time has shown us that some of William Proxmire's Golden Fleece Awardees have proven to be golden geese, as Ranking Member JOHNSON mentioned in her opening statement.

I think much of the criticism of grants comes from misunderstandings. This bill can help prevent misunderstandings or at least give NSF a better ability to defend its work. This will come from the requirement that abstracts be rewritten to more plainly explain the purpose of a grant.

I applaud the NSF for steps they have already taken to better explain why scientific research is valuable and to better explain why promoting the progress of science is in the Nation's interest and worthy of Federal funds. This policy and this bill will further help the NSF defend worthwhile grants.

All of us may never see eye to eye on what types of research should be supported by the Federal Government. For example, I see more value in social science and geoscience than many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I never miss an opportunity to point that out.

But far from acting as a political filter, I believe this bill will help the NSF continue to be the world's preeminent foundation in funding scientific research, and that is why I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out that this grant was mentioned earlier in remarks. In defense of their misguided efforts, some of our colleagues like to pick certain grants and make fun of them—just as has just been said—and then say they are not worth funding.

One of the grants that my colleagues like to pick on is a grant entitled, "Ecosystems Resilience to Human Impacts: Ecological Consequences of Early Human-Set Fires in New Zealand." It may be easy for some of my colleagues to question why the Federal Government should spend money on studying fires that were set in a foreign country hundreds of years ago. Apparently, it is harder for them to spend 5 minutes reading the abstract.

It turns out that those early settlers in New Zealand caused the loss of more

than 40 percent of the forests in just decades. By studying the long-term effect on the ecosystem impacts of those long-ago fires, we can gain knowledge to help natural resource managers make smarter decisions about how to mitigate, prepare for, and respond to massive wildfires in our own country. It is right in the public interest.

Just to put an economic figure to this, in 2012, the United States spent \$2 billion to suppress over 65,000 wildland fires that burned over 9 million acres.

□ 1530

It sounds like this is of national interest to study the long term impact of fires that were set so many years ago. I choose to stand with the scientists when it comes to science. For that reason, I really uphold this misguided bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have one more Member on the way to the floor to speak, and then I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have no further requests for time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), who is on his way to the podium right now.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3293, the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act.

The National Science Foundation spends \$7 billion in taxpayer funds, most of which goes to important research that helps advance America's competitive edge. However, the NSF has funded far too many wasteful projects that are not in the national interest.

Here are several examples: \$1.5 million to study pasture management in Mongolia; \$147,000 to study international marriages between the citizens of France and Madagascar; \$20,000 to study stress among the people of Bolivia.

While the NSF has begun to implement some new internal policies that are intended to increase transparency and accountability, this bill will help strengthen those reforms and make them permanent.

The Director of the NSF even testified before the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee that the policy of H.R. 3293 is "compatible with the NSF's internal guidelines."

I highly commend Chairman LAMAR SMITH for his leadership on this important bill, and I encourage my colleagues to very much support it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, once again, I stand with the scientists. I also stand with the President's potential statement. If this bill is presented to the President, scientists have recommended that he veto it.

I stand with the scientists again and ask the people to vote against this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I am glad that the gentlewoman brought up the administration's position on this bill because it is absolutely no surprise.

When President Obama was elected, he promised that this would be the most transparent administration in history. It has turned out to be the exact opposite.

Opposing a bill to bring more transparency to government, more accountability to the National Science Foundation is a perfect natural for this administration.

Let me give you some more examples. According to an analysis of Federal data by the Associated Press, the Obama administration set new records 2 years in a row for denying the media access to government files.

More than that, in an unprecedented letter to several congressional committees, 47 inspectors general, who are the official watchdogs of Federal agencies, complained that the Justice Department, EPA, and others consistently obstruct their work by blocking or delaying access to critical information.

This is the record, this is the history of an administration who opposes this bill. Again, a bill that is going to bring transparency and accountability to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, it seems obvious to most of us and to most Americans that taxpayer-funded grants should be in the national interest, but let me address some of the false arguments that have been presented by Members on the other side.

Opponents claim that the bill interferes with the merit-review process for approving grants. This is false. The three-page bill clearly states "nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the Foundation's intellectual merit or broader impacts criteria for evaluating grant applications."

Scientists still make the decisions. They just do not get a blank check written by the taxpayer. They need to be accountable to the American people by showing that their proposals are in the national interest.

What the bill does do is ensure that the results of the peer-review process are transparent and that the broader societal impact of the research is better communicated to the public. This makes it clear how the grant is in the national interest.

Another common falsehood spread by opponents of the bill is that it means research projects will be judged by the title as to whether or not they are worthy of Federal funding. Again, this is false. The bill actually corrects a past problem with some NSF-funded grants.

Often, the title and an incomprehensible summary were all that was publicly available about a research grant. The bill ensures that a project's benefits are clearly communicated to earn the public support and trust. Researchers should embrace the opportunity to

better explain to the American people the potential value of their work.

Finally, opponents have claimed that the bill discourages high-risk, high-reward research. Once again, this is false. Research with the potential to be groundbreaking is almost always worthy of Federal funding and in the national interest.

Basic research, by its very nature, is uncertain regarding outcomes and results, but payoffs to society, quality of life, and standards of living can be transformative.

Research that has the potential to address some of society's greatest challenges is what the NSF should be funding.

Improving computing and cybersecurity, advancing new energy sources, discovering new medicines and cures, and creating advanced materials are just some of the ways that NSF-funded research can help create millions of new jobs and transform society in a positive way.

On the other hand, how does spending \$700,000 on a climate change musical encourage breakthrough research? There may well be good answers to those questions, but we weren't able to come up with them, and neither was the National Science Foundation.

When the NSF funds projects that don't meet such standards, there is less money to support worthwhile research that keeps our country at the forefront of innovation.

Both the National Science Foundation Director and the National Science Board have endorsed the principle that NSF should be more accountable in its grant-funding decisions.

Why would Congress oppose such a commonsense requirement? Why do opponents of this bill think they know better than the NSF Director, who has approved the national interest standard in the current guidelines?

It is just inconceivable to me that an elected U.S. Representative would oppose requiring government grants funded by the U.S. taxpayer to be spent in the national interest. Whose money do they think the NSF spends on these frivolous research grants? The taxpayers should know how their hard-earned dollars are, in fact, being spent.

I ask my colleagues to bolster transparency and accountability, protect American taxpayers, and promote good, fundamental science and basic research.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois who spoke just a minute ago. He made a really, really good point that I want to repeat, and that is that this bill is actually going to help strengthen the National Science Foundation because it is going to give it more credibility and taxpayers are going to have more assurance that their hard-earned money is being spent on worthwhile projects that are, in fact, in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, taxpayers spend \$6 billion; \$6 billion is being spent by the Na-

tional Science Foundation. They only approve one out of five grant requests.

Shouldn't those grant proposals be in the national interest? Shouldn't they be about breakthrough technology, technological inventions? Shouldn't they increase productivity in America? I think that is exactly how the taxpayers' dollars should be spent.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do is to give more examples of how the taxpayers' dollars actually should not be spent. These are grants that have been approved by the National Science Foundation in the past.

Again, I want to give the current Director full credit. She has changed the standards. She has implemented the national interest as a part of their guidelines. But if we don't make these guidelines permanent, this is what could happen.

This is how the taxpayers' dollars have been spent:

\$250,000 to survey public attitudes about the Senate filibuster rule;

\$276,000 to study the prehistory of Chiapas, Mexico;

\$246,000 to study migration and adoption between Peru and Spain;

\$136,000 to study life/history transitions among indigenous people of northern Argentina;

\$27,000 to study Mayan wooden architecture and the salt industry;

\$152,000 to analyze accountability and transparency in China's dairy industry;

\$300,000 to study Cyprus during the Bronze Age;

\$226,000 to study cultural dynamics in western Turkey;

\$119,000 to coordinate an international archaeological project in the South American Andes;

\$60,000 to study the Gamo caste system in southwestern Ethiopia;

\$300,000 to produce an experimental dance program about nature and physics.

Speaking of that, I think there was another \$516,000 to help amateurs create a video game, \$516,000 to help amateurs create a video game called "Relieve Prom Night."

There is no national interest that I am aware of. If there is, they sure ought to point it out before we ask the taxpayers to spend half a million dollars on reliving prom night.

Let's see.

\$605,000 to travel and study why people around the world cheat on their taxes;

\$38,000 to consider whether livestock herding families expand in response to herd growth;

\$193,000 to study human fish consumption in Tanzania from 1300 to 1500 AD;

\$250,000 to educate local TV meteorologists;

\$275,000 to study tourism in northern Norway;

\$450,000 to create the Climate Change Narrative Game;

\$131,000 for a 1-day program about climate change education using giant-screen TVs;

\$430,000 to study Irish climate, environment, and political change in the past 2,000 years;

\$2.5 million to create dioramas for the Oakland Museum of California;

\$590,000 to support private groups advocating drastic climate change;

\$289,000 to study how colonialism and climate change threaten the survival of Arctic peoples in Russia;

\$549,000 to—I am sorry. My time is about expired, and I appreciate that.

I could go on and give dozens and dozens of examples, but I think it is clear that this is not how the American taxpayers' dollars should be spent.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3293, the so-called Scientific Research in the National Interest Act, a bill that would actually hinder the National Science Foundation's (NSF) ability to meet the dynamic demands of science and provide resources across all scientific disciplines without political manipulations. This bill is simply another in a line of Republican efforts to politicize science and jeopardize discovery and innovation.

The NSF engages in remarkable, groundbreaking work. We must continue to support this organization and ensure that America remains a world-wide leader in scientific advances. To that end, I cosponsored a number of amendments with my colleague from Virginia, Mr. BEYER, that would allow NSF scientists to further our understanding of climate and environmental science. Unfortunately my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have displayed such open hostility towards climate science and research that they won't allow a vote on these amendments.

While I believe it's important that the NSF hold itself accountable regarding the research it funds, politicizing scientific research is shortsighted and can damage our ability to compete in the world economy. H.R. 3293 would interfere with ongoing efforts at NSF to better quantify and communicate the value of the research it funds.

Mr. Chair, I am also concerned that this legislation will have a chilling effect on many of the scientists at NSF and throughout our scientific community. This bill would force scientists to second-guess their research based on political whims and require them to justify all their actions according to short-term returns, stifling high-risk, high-reward research and innovation across all fields. We must not squelch creativity, critical thinking, and the open exchange of ideas.

Federal agencies like NIH and NOAA are headquartered in my district and I represent countless federally funded scientists who are advancing knowledge, discovering cures, and developing innovative technologies. I am committed to ensuring that the NSF and all of our research agencies have the resources they need without being subject to superfluous political tests. The valuable work done by our scientists and researchers at NSF and other institutions not only leads to the development of new innovations, but also enables our Na-

tion to attract and retain the top research talent in the world. In order to continue to compete, we need sustained investments free from political interference.

I strongly oppose this bill and any other efforts to needlessly politicize scientific research.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Scientific Research in the National Interest Act".

SEC. 2. GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY IN FEDERAL FUNDING FOR RESEARCH.

(a) STANDARD FOR AWARD OF GRANTS.—The National Science Foundation shall award Federal funding for basic research and education in the sciences through a new research grant or cooperative agreement only if an affirmative determination is made by the Foundation under subsection (b) and written justification relating thereto is published under subsection (c).

(b) DETERMINATION.—A determination referred to in subsection (a) is a justification by the responsible Foundation official as to how the research grant or cooperative agreement promotes the progress of science in the United States, consistent with the Foundation mission as established in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), and further—

(1) is worthy of Federal funding; and

(2) is in the national interest, as indicated by having the potential to achieve—

(A) increased economic competitiveness in the United States;

(B) advancement of the health and welfare of the American public;

(C) development of an American STEM workforce that is globally competitive;

(D) increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology in the United States;

(E) increased partnerships between academia and industry in the United States;

(F) support for the national defense of the United States; or

(G) promotion of the progress of science for the United States.

(c) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.—Public announcement of each award of Federal funding described in subsection (a) shall include a written justification from the responsible Foundation official as to how a grant or cooperative agreement meets the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—A determination under subsection (b) shall be made after a research grant or cooperative agreement proposal has satisfied the Foundation's reviews for Merit and Broader Impacts. Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the Foundation's intellectual merit or broader impacts criteria for evaluating grant applications.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114-420. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an oppo-

nent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114-420.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 15, through page 4, line 15, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

(b) DETERMINATION.—A determination referred to in subsection (a) is a justification by the responsible Foundation official as to how the research grant or cooperative agreement—

(1) by itself, or by contributing to a portfolio of research in that field or across fields, is in the national interest as reflected in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq), namely to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity and welfare, and to secure the national defense; and

(2) is worthy of Federal funding, as demonstrated by having met the merit review criteria of the Foundation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, has stated many times that H.R. 3293 is consistent with the policy announced by NSF in January 2015.

He also frequently cites a year old comment by NSF Director Dr. Cordova about this bill. However, it is one thing to use such vague statements in defense of this bill; it is quite another thing to look directly at the NSF policy issued by Dr. Cordova to see what it actually says.

□ 1545

I will quote directly from NSF's January 2015 policy:

The nontechnical component of the NSF award abstract must serve as a public justification for NSF funding by articulating how the project serves the national interest, as stated by NSF's mission, to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; and to secure national defense.

As Dr. Holdren, the President's Science Adviser, said:

According to the clear wording and intent of the 1950 act that created the National Science Foundation, promoting the progress of science through basic research is in the national interest.

Likewise, Dr. Cordova, in describing what she means by "national interest,"

points directly to the 1950 NSF mission statement. In her policy, there is no separate list defining national interest with criteria that, in fact, promotes more applied research, not basic research.

While the words “promoting the progress of science” appear in the bill before us, they do so only as an afterthought, in dead last place and added only after many versions of this bill.

Now that we all understand the National Science Foundation’s actual policy, I can briefly explain my amendment.

By tying the term “national interest” to the 1950 national statement, my amendment brings the bill truly in line with the National Science Foundation’s own policy for transparency and accountability.

My amendment also provides clarity to what we mean by the words “worthy of Federal funding,” by stating that anything that has passed the rigor of the National Science Foundation’s peer-review process is “worthy of Federal funding.”

In short, my amendment fixes the underlying bill by removing restrictions that may stifle high-risk basic research, and by taking decisions about grant funding out of the hands of politicians and putting it back in the hands of scientists, where it belongs.

The National Science Foundation’s 1950 mission statement, implemented through its gold standard merit-review process, has served science and this Nation so well. Let’s leave it intact by passing my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentlewoman’s amendment, which undermines the bill and weakens accountability and transparency.

First, the amendment seeks to dilute the bill’s requirement that the grant must be worthy of Federal funding. It is difficult to understand why anyone would have objections to requiring that a research grant be worthy of taxpayer support. Worthy means: having adequate or great merit, character, or value; and commendable excellence or merit; deserving.

The opposite of worthy of Federal funding are awards of taxpayer money to frivolous, low-priority projects, like producing a climate change musical, creating a voicemail game, or studying tourism in Norway.

One would think that fundamental standards like “worthy of Federal funding” and “in the national interest” would already be embedded in the standards the National Science Foundation uses to evaluate thousands of grant applications and decide which ones should receive \$6 billion in basic research grants each year. From the Science, Space, and Technology Committee’s review of past NSF grants, we have learned that this is not always the case.

This amendment eliminates the requirement that each grant be worthy of Federal funding. It asserts that any grant approved by NSF through its merit selection system will be considered worthy of Federal funding. With this change, every NSF-funded project would be considered worthy of Federal funding, no matter how absurd.

With this amendment, Congress would effectively abnegate its responsibility to ensure that NSF spends taxpayer dollars only on projects worthy of Federal funding.

The underlying bill does not interfere with the National Science Foundation’s merit selection process. I have already quoted from the bill twice tonight. It only requires that NSF be transparent and explain in writing and in nontechnical terms why each research project that receives public funds is in the national interest. Taxpayers deserve this information. It is their money.

Moreover, in order to maintain an increased public support for vital investment in basic research, NSF must be transparent and accountable and explain why every scientific investment deserves to receive hard-earned tax dollars.

NSF Director France Cordova and her team at NSF understand this. That is why the NSF is implementing new policies to make NSF grant-making more transparent and understandable for the American people.

These policies acknowledge the primary importance of national interest in awarding tax dollars. In fact, during her testimony before the Science, Space, and Technology Committee last year, Dr. Cordova described this national interest act and NSF’s new transparency policies as consistent and fully compatible with each other.

I would like to remind everyone that it is not Congress’ or the NSF’s money. It is the American people’s money.

The amendment offered by the ranking member seeks to change the section of the bill that requires NSF to accompany public announcement of every grant award with a nontechnical explanation of the award’s scientific merit and national interest.

My concern is that the proposed amendment would create a loophole through which blocks of hundreds of grants in a particular area of science would be justified by just one general statement. This is the opposite of accountability and transparency.

I strongly oppose the amendment for these reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this does not do any more than what was intended under the law. It leaves it in the hands of the peer review board and not the politicians.

It does nothing to make this bill worse. In fact, it improves it so that it can meet the charter of this Congress in doing its work.

Every grant that goes out of the National Science Foundation is peer-reviewed in a system that was set up 60 years ago. It has worked well. We have gained great research. I don’t think that making sure that the politicians have something to say about it makes it any better. It makes it worse.

I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the National Science Foundation Director and the National Science Board have both expressed and endorsed a principle that NSF should be more transparent and accountable in its grant funding decisions. In fact, the NSF has already incorporated the national interest standard in their guidelines.

This amendment creates loopholes and dilutes the intent of the bill—a bill that NSF Director France Cordova has testified: is very compatible with the new internal NSF guidelines and with the mission statement of the National Science Foundation.

I ask my colleagues to say “yes” to accountability and transparency and “no” to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114-420.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike “and”.
Page 3, line 23, redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

Page 3, after line 22, insert the following:
(2) is consistent with established and widely accepted scientific methods applicable to the field of study of exploration; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for her leadership. I also want to thank Mr. SMITH for his chairmanship of the committee.

I have known the commitment to science that so many Members have. I hope that my amendment reinforces the emphasis that we have had with respect to science.

Scientists should control the direction and guidance of our research. The National Science Foundation does simply that. I hope that both of my amendments contribute to that premise, and I would like to acknowledge the Rules Committee for making these amendments in order.

The Jackson Lee amendment seeks to improve H.R. 3293 by ensuring that NSF-funded research, as it has been, remains consistent with established and widely accepted scientific methods applicable to the study of exploration.

In conducting experiments or research in new areas of inquiry, grant recipients would now follow protocols that ensure that the outcomes of research are able to be reproduced by other scientists or researchers.

I have always believed that science is the work that creates the ultimate work in decades and centuries to come. Having served on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee some years back, I used to always say: science is the work of the 21st century. If you create in science, innovation, products, and research, you create opportunities for jobs and products to be sold. This is what good science is all about and why basic research relies on the scientific method in the routine practice of scientists and researchers around the world.

I fully believe that the National Science Foundation gets it. That is what their underlying work is about.

The Jackson Lee amendment will support the promise that basic research is conducted with the expectation that good science should be the underlying goal. History has shown that basic research often leads to results with the utmost beneficial consequences for society.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making the Jackson Lee Amendment in order for consideration under H.R. 3293, the "Scientific Research in the National Interest Act."

My thanks and appreciation to Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their support of this amendment and their staffs for working with my staff to ensure the amendment reflects a goal we all share.

The Jackson Lee amendment improves H.R. 3293, by ensuring that NSF funded research, as it has been, remains consistent with established and widely accepted scientific methods applicable to the study of exploration.

In conducting experiments or research in new areas of inquiry, grant recipients would now follow protocols that ensure that the outcomes of research are able to be reproduced by other scientists or researchers.

This is what good science is all about and this is why basic research relies on the scientific method in the routine practice of scientists and researchers around the world.

In 1950, Congress passed the National Science Foundation Act to "promote the

progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; and to secure the national defense; in addition to other purposes" by creating the National Science Foundation.

The Act authorized and directed the Foundation to "initiate and support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen the potential of scientific research and education programs at all levels in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, social, and other sciences."

The 1950 Act also authorized and directed NSF to fund applied scientific and engineering research.

One hundred years of basic scientific research has revealed its value, exemplified in the advances that helped our nation win World War II and allowed Congress to appreciate science as the gateway to the pre-eminent economic global success the nation could achieve.

This Jackson Lee Amendment would support the promise that basic research is conducted with the expectation that good science should be the underlying goal.

History has shown that basic research often leads to results with the utmost beneficial consequences for society; although, at the time that basic research is conducted, it may be impossible to predict how it will benefit the nation or the world.

One such example is the Genomic studies of nematode worms that led to the discovery of genes that ultimately control cell death; this study in turn opened the avenues of discovery for new treatment possibilities for cancer and Alzheimer's Disease.

Additionally, basic research on atomic physics led to the development of the atomic clocks that now enable the highly precise Global Positioning System (GPS) used to guide commercial aircraft to their destinations.

In 2014, due to a global embrace of scientific research the world saw:

The first landing of a space craft on the surface of a comet;

The discovery of a new fundamental particle, which provided information on the origin of the universe;

Development of the world's fastest super-computer; and

A surge in research on plant biology that is uncovering new and better ways to meet global food needs.

Unfortunately none of these achievements were led by our nation's researchers or scientists.

I ask my colleagues to support this Jackson Lee Amendment so that we may make strides toward joining and surpassing our global competitors in the emerging scientific community.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment requires that, in addition to the National Science Founda-

tion making a determination that a grant is worthy of Federal funding and in the national interest, the NSF must also determine that the grant is: consistent with established and widely accepted scientific methods applicable to the field of study or exploration.

I agree that this is an important determination. Basic research funded by taxpayers must have a sound scientific foundation.

Reproducibility—the ability of an entire experiment or study to be duplicated—especially by someone else working independently, is the gold standard in the scientific method.

NSF should ensure that the research it funds meets this gold standard so taxpayer dollars do not go to waste.

I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I do support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Texas and the ranking member for their support.

With that, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114-420.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike "and".

Page 3, line 23, redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

Page 3, after line 22, insert the following:

(2) is consistent with the definition of basic research as it applies to the purpose and field of study; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I restate my earlier premise that science is the work of the 21st century. Maybe we will be saying the 22nd century. Because when you are innovative and do research, you create jobs and opportunities. This amendment establishes that basic research is in the national interest of the United States.

Let me suggest to you that we have a lot of universities in this country. When I travel, I always hear individuals seeking to come to be taught in American institutions of higher education. It is because of the creative thought and, in many instances, the research that is done, whether in medicine or all the forms of science and

technology, because we have a free-flowing basis upon which people can think and invent. I want that to continue. I want the National Science Foundation to be at the cornerstone of that.

I will include in the RECORD an article titled, “The Future Postponed.” Why Declining Investment in Basic Research Threatens a U.S. Innovation Deficit.

[From the Massachusetts Institute of Technology]

THE FUTURE POSTPONED

WHY DECLINING INVESTMENT IN BASIC RESEARCH THREATENS A U.S. INNOVATION DEFICIT

(A Report by the MIT Committee to Evaluate the Innovation Deficit)

2014 was a year of notable scientific highlights, including:

- the first landing on a comet, which has already shed important light on the formation of the Earth;

- the discovery of a new fundamental particle, which provides critical information on the origin of the universe;

- development of the world’s fastest supercomputer;

- a surge in research on plant biology that is uncovering new and better ways to meet global food requirements.

None of these, however, were U.S.-led achievements. The first two reflected 10-year, European-led efforts; the second two are Chinese accomplishments, reflecting that nation’s emergence as a science and technology power. Hence the wide-spread concern over a growing U.S. innovation deficit, attributable in part to declining public investment in research (see figure).

This report provides a number of tangible examples of under-exploited areas of science and likely consequences in the form of an innovation deficit, including:

- opportunities with high potential for big payoffs in health, energy, and high-tech industries;

- fields where we risk falling behind in critical strategic capabilities such as supercomputing, secure information systems, and national defense technologies;

- areas where national prestige is at stake, such as space exploration, or where a lack of specialized U.S. research facilities is driving key scientific talent to work overseas.

This introduction also cites examples of the benefits from basic research that have helped to shape and maintain U.S. economic power, as well as highlighting industry trends that have made university basic research even more critical to future national economic competitiveness.

Basic research is often misunderstood, because it often seems to have no immediate payoff. Yet it was just such federally-funded research into the fundamental working of cells, intensified beginning with the “War on Cancer” in 1971, that led over time to a growing arsenal of sophisticated new anti-cancer therapies—19 new drugs approved by the U.S. FDA in the past 2 years. Do we want similar progress on Alzheimer’s, which already affects 5 million Americans, more than any single form of cancer? Then we should expand research in neurobiology, brain chemistry, and the science of aging (see Alzheimer’s Disease). The Ebola epidemic in West Africa is a reminder of how vulnerable we are to a wider pandemic of emergent viral diseases, because of a lack of research on their biology; an even greater public health threat looms from the rise of antibiotic resistant bacteria right here at home, which, because commercial incentives are lacking,

only expanded university-based research into new types of antibiotics can address (see Infectious Disease).

America’s emergence last year as the world’s largest oil producer has been justly celebrated as a milestone for energy independence. But the roots of the fracking revolution stem from federally-funded research—begun in the wake of the first OPEC oil embargo 40 years ago—that led to directional drilling technology, diamond drill bits tough enough to cut shale, and the first major hydraulic fracturing experiments. Do we also want the U.S. to be a leader in clean energy technologies a few decades hence, when these will be needed for large scale replacement of fossil energy sources, a huge global market? Then now is when more investment in advanced thin film solar cells, new battery concepts, and novel approaches to fusion energy should begin (see Materials Discovery and Processing, Batteries, Fusion Energy).

Some areas of research create opportunities of obvious economic importance. Catalysis, for example, is already a \$500 billion industry in the United States alone and plays a critical role in the manufacture of virtually every fuel, all types of plastics, and many pharmaceuticals. Yet today’s catalysts are relatively inefficient and require high temperatures compared to those (such as enzymes) that operate in living things. So the potential payoff in both reduced environmental impact and a powerful economic edge for countries that invest in efforts to understand and replicate these biological catalysts—as Germany and China already are—could be huge (see Catalysis). The U.S. also lags in two other key areas: developing advances in plant sciences that can help meet growing world needs for food while supporting U.S. agricultural exports, and the growing field of robotics that is important not only for automated factories but for a whole new era of automated services such as driverless vehicles (see Plant Sciences and Robotics).

In an increasingly global and competitive world, where knowledge is created and first applied has huge economic consequences: some 50 years after the rise of Silicon Valley, the U.S. still leads in the commercial application of integrated circuits, advanced electronic devices, and internet businesses. But foreseeable advances in optical integrated circuits, where both Europe and Japan are investing heavily, is likely to completely reshape the \$300 billion semiconductor industry that today is largely dominated by U.S. companies (see Photonics). In this area and other fields of science that will underlie the innovation centers of the future, U.S. leadership or even competitiveness is at risk. Synthetic biology—the ability to redesign life in the lab—is another area that has huge potential to transform bio-manufacturing and food production and to create breakthroughs in healthcare—markets that might easily exceed the size of the technology market. But it is EU scientists that benefit from superior facilities and dedicated funding and are leading the way (see Synthetic Biology). Research progress in many such fields increasingly depends on sophisticated modern laboratories and research instruments, the growing lack of which in the U.S. is contributing to a migration of top talent and research leadership overseas.

Some areas of research are so strategically important that for the U.S. to fall behind ought to be alarming. Yet Chinese leadership in supercomputing—its Tianhe-2 machine at the Chinese National University of Defense in Guangzhou has won top ranking for the third year in a row and can now do quadrillions of calculations per second—is just such a straw in the wind. Another is our apparent and growing vulnerability to cyberattacks of

the type that have damaged Sony, major banks, large retailers, and other major companies. Ultimately, it will be basic research in areas such as photonics, cybersecurity, and quantum computing (where China is investing heavily) that determine leadership in secure information systems, in secure long distance communications, and in super-computing (see Cybersecurity and Quantum Information Systems). Recent budget cuts have impacted U.S. efforts in all these areas. Also, technologies are now in view that could markedly improve the way we protect our soldiers and other war fighters while improving their effectiveness in combat (see Defense Technology).

It is not just areas of science with obvious applications that are important. Some observers have asked, “What good is it?” of the discovery of the Higgs boson (the particle referred to above, which fills a major gap in our understanding of the fundamental nature of matter). But it is useful to remember that similar comments might have been made when the double helix structure of DNA was first understood (many decades before the first biotech drug), when the first transistor emerged from research in solid state physics (many decades before the IT revolution), when radio waves were first discovered (long before radios or broadcast networks were even conceived of). We are a remarkably inventive species, and seem always to find ways to put new knowledge to work.

Other potential discoveries could have global impacts of a different kind. Astronomers have now identified hundreds of planets around other stars, and some of them are clearly Earth-like. Imagine what it would mean to our human perspective if we were to discover evidence of life on these planets—a signal that we are not alone in the universe—from observations of their planetary atmospheres, something that is potentially within the technical capability of space-based research within the next decade? Or if the next generation of space telescopes can discover the true nature of the mysterious “dark matter” and “dark energy” that appear to be the dominant constituents of the universe (see Space Exploration).

Do we want more efficient government, more market-friendly regulatory structures? Social and economic research is increasingly able to provide policymakers with useful guidance. Witness the way government has helped to create mobile and broadband markets by auctioning the wireless spectrum—complex, carefully-designed auctions based on insights from game theory and related research that have netted the federal government more than \$60 billion while catalyzing huge new industries and transformed the way we live and do business. Empowered by access to more government data and Big Data tools, such research could point the way to still more efficient government (see Enabling Better Policy Decisions).

In the past, U.S. industry took a long term view of R&D and did fundamental research, activities associated with such entities as the now-diminished Bell Labs and Xerox Park. That’s still the case in some other countries such as South Korea. Samsung, for example, spent decades of effort to develop the underlying science and manufacturing behind organic light-emitting diodes (OLEDs) before commercializing these into the now familiar, dramatic displays in TVs and many other digital devices. But today, as competitive pressures have increased, basic research has essentially disappeared from U.S. companies, leaving them dependent on federally-funded, university-based basic research to fuel innovation. This shift means that federal support of basic research is even more tightly coupled to national economic competitiveness. Moreover, there will

always be circumstances when private investment lags—when the innovation creates a public good, such as clean air, for which an investor can't capture the value, or when the risk is too high, such as novel approaches to new antibiotic drugs, or when the technical complexity is so high that there is fundamental uncertainty as to the outcome, such as with quantum computing or fusion energy. For these cases, government funding is the only possible source to spur innovation.

This central role of federal research support means that sudden changes in funding levels such as the recent sequester can disrupt research efforts and cause long term damage, especially to the pipeline of scientific talent on which U.S. research leadership ultimately depends. In a survey of the effects of reduced research funding conducted by the Chronicle of Higher Education last year among 11,000 recipients of NIH and NSF research grants, nearly half have abandoned an area of investigation they considered critical to their lab's mission, and more than three quarters have fired or failed to hire graduate students and research fellows. Other evidence suggests that many of those affected switch careers, leaving basic research behind forever.

Despite these challenges, the potential benefits from expanding basic research summarized in these pages—an innovation dividend that could boost our economy, improve human lives, and strengthen the U.S. strategically—are truly inspiring. We hope you will find the information useful.

□ 1600

What this paper cites, in 2014, notable scientific advancements included landing of a manmade Earth object on a comet, discovery of a new fundamental particle which provided vital information on the origin of the universe, development of the world's fastest supercomputer, and a tremendous increase in plant biology that is discovering new and better ways to make global food requirements.

None of these, however, Mr. Chairman, were U.S.-led. So my amendment turns our attention, again, maybe to the obvious. Maybe if I say Alexander Bell, as we learned as children in school, everybody knew that he created the telephone.

George Washington Carver was associated with the many scientific discoveries out of a single peanut, someone that those of us, in this month of African American History, when they would teach us African American History, we would all know George Washington Carver, that we had a real role model that was a scientist and that generated probably thousands of scientists, people of African American heritage and beyond.

So I want my amendment to emphasize that we want the long list of innovation to be on our side and to continue the tradition and trajectory that we have had of basic research that then applies to all levels to create opportunities of work and genius that is here in this country.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making three Jackson Lee Amendments in order for consideration under H.R. 3293, the "Scientific Research in the National Interest Act."

My thanks and appreciation to Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON's staff for working with my staff on drafting this amendment.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 4—adds to the list of goals in the national interest—the conduct of basic research that follow well established protocols and scientific methods.

The scientific method—it is what happens every day and can lead to basic research experiments conducted by scientists.

Basic research is the foundation of tomorrow's innovations.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help ensure that the nature of basic research is preserved because without basic research the United States will be dependent on others to make and reap the tremendous economic rewards from new discoveries.

Applied science depends on a well-grounded understanding of the basic research that leads to discovery.

I call my colleagues attention to a groundbreaking report by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology entitled "The Future Postponed: Why Declining Investment in Basic Research Threatens a U.S. Innovation Deficit."

For much of our history, the United States' industries took a long term view of research and development and did fundamental research, activities associated with basic research at Bell Labs and Xerox Park.

Today, as competitive pressures have increased, basic research has essentially disappeared from U.S. companies, leaving them dependent upon federally-funded, university-based basic research to fuel innovation.

In 2014, notable scientific advancements included:

1. landing of a man made earth object on a comet;
2. discovery of a new fundamental particle, which provided vital information on the origin of the universe; development of the world's fastest supercomputer; and
3. a tremendous increase in plant biology that is discovering new and better ways to meet global food requirements.

These are wonderful accomplishments, but none of them were U.S. led.

The first two were European in origin and the second two were accomplished by China.

China landed the Jade Rabbit, its first lunar probe on the moon, and on Sunday North Korea launched a long range rocket that put a satellite into space that flew over the location of the Super Bowl.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is intended to strengthen the nation's commitment to basic research so that the United States remains preeminent in the field of discovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), her second amendment that we are accepting on this side of the aisle.

I believe this amendment, in combination with the previous amendment,

aims to ensure that the National Science Foundation grants fund research that meets the highest standards so taxpayer dollars are not wasted on frivolous grants or poorly designed research proposals.

This amendment recognizes the National Science Foundation's basic research mission and endorses applying the bill's national interest standards and criteria to National Science Foundation's basic research grants.

I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for supporting this amendment, and I thank the ranking member for supporting it.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that, in addition to following protocol, we must invest funds, money, in basic research.

But I also want to take note of something that I have watched over the years, and I have added amendments, and I have seen the growth.

One of my first acts on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee was to utilize laboratory tools or equipment that were no longer needed by the Federal Government in its national science lab to give them to middle schools and high schools so that they would have access to this kind of equipment. Many of us know that there are schools all throughout America who are deficient in science labs. I see them in my district. I hear about them.

I think the other important point is that, over the years, we have expanded the research collaboration to Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Native American-Serving, rural, and colleges that serve the economically disadvantaged.

Those are good things because we don't know where the genius is America and how many people may come up with outstanding research. So I hope that we do focus on how important basic research is.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114-420.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 6, insert ", including computer science and information technology sectors," after "workforce".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to ensure the National Science Foundation can continue investing in the development of an American workforce that is globally competitive in computer science and information technology. This has been a bipartisan goal in the past, and I am hopeful everyone in this Chamber will be able to support it.

Computing technology has become an integral part of our lives, transforming our society and our Nation's economy. Nowhere is this clearer than in the Puget Sound region. I have the honor of representing Washington's First District, which has some of the world's leading software companies and technology innovators.

But the same can be seen across the country. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there will be roughly 10 million STEM jobs by 2020 and, of those jobs, half are expected to be in computing and information technology. That is nearly 5 million good-paying jobs. But unless we step up our game, our country won't have enough computer science graduates to fill those positions.

Today, there continues to be a substantial shortage of Americans with the skills needed to fill computing jobs, and too few of our students are being given the opportunity to learn computer science, both at the K-12 level and in college. What is worse, dramatic disparities remain for girls and students of color.

Last year, less than 25 percent of students taking the AP Computer Science exam were girls, while less than 15 percent were African American or Latino.

To remain economically competitive, we need to make smart investments now to address these disparities and ensure we have a strong 21st century workforce in the decades to come. Thankfully, NSF supports vital research and development projects to help prepare the next generation to compete in STEM jobs, something we all agree is an important goal.

My amendment simply clarifies that, under the legislation, NSF can also invest in projects aimed at developing an American workforce that is globally competitive in computing and information technology, sectors that are seeing enormous growth here at home and around the globe.

If we want our students to be prepared for the digital economy, NSF must be able to fund projects that support the teaching and learning of essential computer science skills like coding, programming, designing, and debugging. My amendment will do just that. It will ensure we are looking forward and preparing students for the college degrees and careers of the future.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentlewoman's amendment. It clarifies that it is in the national interest to fund grants that support the development of an American STEM workforce that is globally competitive and that includes computer science and the information technology sectors.

In October, the President signed into law the STEM Education Act, a bill that I introduced with my colleague Ms. ESTY, which expands the definition of STEM to include computer science. This amendment reinforces that new Federal definition of STEM. It is a perfecting amendment to the bill, and I welcome it.

I agree with my colleague that it is in the national interest to support creating training a STEM workforce which includes computer science, and I support her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. I want to thank the chairman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114-420.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 3, add the following:

(e) CLARIFICATION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impact Federal funding for research grants or cooperative agreements awarded by the National Science Foundation prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an important amendment for scientists across the country who are engaged in ongoing research funded by the National Science Foundation.

As everyone in this Chamber knows, research and innovation are central to American competitiveness and driving our national economy. Each year, investments in research through NSF help us push the boundaries of scientific knowledge, support new industries, and address the challenges facing our society.

I don't think anyone would deny that funding for NSF has overwhelmingly benefited our country. It is also key to our country's economic growth. Funding new explorations in science and

technology is how we stay on the cutting edge of research; it is how we continue to compete globally in the 21st century economy.

That is why I have serious concerns about the implications of the underlying legislation, which needlessly inserts a layer of political review into the scientific research process. To remain a world leader, we need to ensure scientists are exploring transformative new ideas and frontiers based on the merits of their research, not the subjective opinions of politicians in Congress.

Unfortunately, those subjective opinions are exactly what is being injected into the process under this legislation; and what is worse, it has the potential to put ongoing research at risk. By changing the rules about how NSF funding is awarded, scientists across the country may rightfully be concerned about how this legislation affects the important work that they are doing today.

As someone who started her career in research, I can tell you firsthand it is incredibly important that you have the certainty to see a project through to the end. Starting and stopping research is highly detrimental.

We should provide scientists the long-term visibility to know their ongoing research can be completed without interference from politicians, and that is precisely what my amendment does. My amendment simply clarifies that the underlying legislation does not impact any grant funding that has already been awarded by the NSF. It is critical that we pass it to ensure ongoing research is not disrupted by this unfortunate bill.

Mr. Chairman, research isn't a spigot you can turn on and off. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentlewoman's amendment. It clarifies that the new requirements in the bill do not apply to grants that have already been awarded by the National Science Foundation. I agree that the bill is not intended to be retroactive.

In January 2015, NSF began to implement new internal guidelines that promote accountability and transparency. These guidelines are compatible with this bill, but the implementation of them is a work in progress. I will continue to communicate with NSF about how they implement their internal guidelines, but agree that this bill will only apply to future grants, once enacted.

So, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
 Ms. DELBENE. I thank the chairman for his support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
 The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3293) to provide for greater accountability in Federal funding for scientific research, to promote the progress of science in the United States that serves that national interest, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2017, COMMON SENSE NUTRITION DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 15, 2016, THROUGH FEBRUARY 22, 2016

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-421) on the resolution (H. Res. 611) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A, and providing for proceedings during the period from February 15, 2016, through February 22, 2016, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 609 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on

the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3293.

Will the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) kindly take the chair.

□ 1647

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3293) to provide for greater accountability in Federal funding for scientific research, to promote the progress of science in the United States that serves that national interest, with Mr. BLUM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114-420, offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 235, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—181

Adams	Cuellar	Hastings
Aguilar	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Ashford	Curbelo (FL)	Higgins
Bass	Davis (CA)	Himes
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Hinojosa
Becerra	DeFazio	Honda
Bera	DeGette	Hoyer
Beyer	Delaney	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Israel
Blumenauer	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	DeSaunier	Jeffries
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
F.	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Dold	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Bustos	F.	Kildee
Butterfield	Edwards	Kilmer
Capps	Ellison	Kind
Capuano	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Kuster
Carney	Esty	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Foster	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Lee
Cicilline	Fudge	Levin
Clark (MA)	Gabbard	Lewis
Clarke (NY)	Galleo	Lieu, Ted
Clay	Garamendi	Loebsock
Cleaver	Graham	Lofgren
Clyburn	Grayson	Lowenthal
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowe
Connolly	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Conyers	Grijalva	(NM)
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Courtney	Hahn	(NM)
Crowley	Hanna	Lynch

Maloney, Carolyn	Pingree	Speier
Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
Matsui	Polis	Takai
McCollum	Price (NC)	Takano
McDermott	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McGovern	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Meng	Ruiz	Torres
Moore	Ruppersberger	Tsongas
Moulton	Rush	Van Hollen
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vargas
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Veasey
Napolitano	T.	Vela
Neal	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Nolan	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Norcross	Schiff	Walz
O'Rourke	Schrader	Wasserman
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Pascarell	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine
Payne	Serrano	Watson Coleman
Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Perlmutter	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Peters	Sires	Yarmuth
	Slaughter	

NOES—235

Abraham	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)
Allen	Gosar	Mulvaney
Amash	Granger	Murphy (PA)
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Neugebauer
Babin	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barletta	Griffith	Noem
Barr	Grothman	Nugent
Barton	Guinta	Nunes
Benishek	Guthrie	Olson
Bilirakis	Hardy	Palazzo
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Palmer
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Paulsen
Black	Hartzler	Pearce
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Perry
Blum	Hensarling	Peterson
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Boustany	Hill	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Holding	Poe (TX)
Brat	Huelskamp	Poliquin
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Pompeo
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Posey
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Price, Tom
Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Ratcliffe
Buck	Issa	Reed
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Reichert
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Renacci
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Rigell
Carter (TX)	Jones	Roby
Chabot	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Clawson (FL)	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Roskam
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross
Conaway	Kline	Rothfus
Cook	Knight	Rouzer
Costa	Labrador	Royce
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Russell
Cramer	LaMalfa	Salmon
Crawford	Lamborn	Sanford
Crenshaw	Lance	Scalise
Culberson	Latta	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Denham	Long	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Loudermilk	Sessions
DeSantis	Love	Shuster
DesJarlais	Lucas	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Sinema
Donovan	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Duffy	MacArthur	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Smith (TX)
Ellmers (NC)	Massie	Stefanik
Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Stewart
Farenthold	McCaul	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McKinley	Thornberry
Flores	McMorris	Tiberi
Forbes	Rodgers	Tipton
Fortenberry	McSally	Trott
Fox	Meadows	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Valadao
Garrett	Mica	Wagner
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walden

Walker	Whitfield	Yoho
Walorski	Williams	Young (AK)
Walters, Mimi	Wilson (SC)	Young (IA)
Weber (TX)	Witman	Young (IN)
Webster (FL)	Womack	Zeldin
Wenstrup	Woodall	Zinke
Westerman	Yoder	

NOT VOTING—17

Castro (TX)	Hudson	Richmond
Duckworth	Huizenga (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Fincher	Kelly (IL)	Shimkus
Gowdy	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Herrera Beutler	Quigley	

□ 1708

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER and NUGENT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ASHFORD and PETERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3293) to provide for greater accountability in Federal funding for scientific research, to promote the progress of science in the United States that serves that national interest, and, pursuant to House Resolution 609, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. EDWARDS. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Edwards moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3293 to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Page 4, line 13, strike “or”.

Page 4, line 15, strike the period and insert “; or”.

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following:

(H) increased understanding of the causes and prevention of gun violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

H.R. 3293, the deceptively entitled Scientific Research in the National Interest Act, represents an effort by the majority to overrule expert scientists in deciding which scientific grants the Federal scientific agency should fund. What this really translates to, Mr. Speaker, is that these are areas that some politicians do not want to fund because they don’t believe in scientists.

Just a week ago, 26-year-old NeShante Davis, a second grade teacher in Fort Washington, and her 2-year-old daughter, Chloe, were gunned down because of child support. We have a gun violence problem in the United States.

According to The American Journal of Medicine, compared to other rich nations, Americans are 25 times more likely to be violently killed with a firearm, 6 times more likely to be accidentally killed with a gun, 8 times more likely to commit suicide using a firearm, and 10 times more likely to die from a gun death overall.

To address this, Americans deserve the facts and Congress needs the breadth and the data for the epidemic. Using the public health approach, we have reduced smoking among Americans from 43 percent, at the time of the first Surgeon General’s report in 1964, to 18 percent.

□ 1715

Since the 1970s, using the public health approach, we have reduced deaths from motor vehicle crashes by more than 70 percent. In 1970, there were over 55,000 deaths from motor vehicle crashes per year. Today there are around 30,000.

So what does the public health approach yield? Well, the essence is this: define the problem, including its magnitude, nature, and distribution in the population; define the cause or risk and protective factors for the problem. What are the characteristics to prevent the problem?

For example, educating people about the risk of guns that come with gun ownership and how to reduce that risk and develop widely implemented programs using proven strategies to prevent the problem, public health can help solve this problem.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), my colleague and cosponsor of the motion.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on every block in every community across America, people are asking what is the Federal Government doing to keep our community safe from gun violence. They are asking for good reason.

Nearly 11,000 Americans were victims of homicide by firearm in 2014. There

was nearly one mass shooting for each day of the year in 2015, according to The New York Times. With these stats, are we doing enough? Can we do more?

Our motion to recommit answers this question by endeavoring to understand the causes of gun violence and learning how we can curb it. As Members of Congress, we have no higher obligation than to protect those we represent.

I urge all Members to live up to that responsibility. Help do all we can to reduce gun violence. Pass this motion to recommit.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, using the public health approach, we have now eradicated smallpox, eliminated polio in most countries, reduced motor vehicle deaths by 70 percent, and reduced smoking rates by over half.

We can do something about gun violence, and we have an obligation to do it today. Just think if we were able to do the same thing to address the gun violence epidemic.

This is a small and yet powerful step with research—just research—that could lead to significantly reducing the number of Americans killed by firearms.

All we want to do is look at the problem. All we want to do is measure the magnitude. All we want to do is find solutions for NeShante Davis, 26 years old, and her 2-year-old daughter, Chloe, gunned down—gunned down.

In every single community across this country, we can do this by enabling the National Science Foundation to just look into the issue and give us some answers so that we can find solutions. We owe it to NeShante. We owe it to Chloe. We owe it to the American people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to treat this like the epidemic that it is. End gun violence in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit.

H.R. 3293, the Scientific Research in the National Interest Act, is a bipartisan bill that ensures the grant process at the National Science Foundation is transparent and accountable to the American people.

America’s future economic growth and national security depend on innovation. Public and private investments in research and development fuel the economy, create jobs, and lead to new technologies that benefit Americans’ daily lives.

NSF invests about \$6 billion of taxpayers’ funds every year on research projects and related activities. Unfortunately, in recent years, the Federal Government has awarded too many grants that few Americans would consider to be in the national interest.

Only one out of five grant proposals are approved. We cannot fund every worthy proposal, much less frivolous ones like \$516,000 to create a video game called "Relive Prom Night."

The legislation before us reaffirms in law that every NSF grant must support research that is in the national interest.

The 1950 enabling legislation that created the NSF set forth the Foundation's mission and cited the national interest as the foundation for public support and dissemination of basic scientific research.

The Science in the National Interest Act reaffirms and restores this crucial mission and requires the NSF grants meet at least one of seven criteria that demonstrate it is in the national interest. This will add transparency, accountability, and credibility to the NSF and its grant process.

Opponents of this bill must think they know better than the NSF Director. Director Cordova testified before the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee that the policy in H.R. 3293 is "compatible with the NSF's internal guidelines." This legislation makes that standard clear, explicit, and permanent.

Scientists still make the decisions. They just do not get a blank check signed by the taxpayer. They need to be accountable to the American people by showing their proposals are in the national interest.

The National Science Foundation has supported and continues to support basic research into the causes and prevention of crime and mass violence. NSF-funded research has included studies of violent impulse behavior, cultural and social factors affecting predisposition to violence, the links between mental disorders and violent behavior, parenting and parental influences over their children's disposition toward violent behavior, and patterns of crime and violence in American cities.

There is no need for this motion to recommit. In fact, it is an inappropriate earmark. For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 241, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownlee (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cioccolone
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbecke
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
Schiff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

McCarthy
McClintock
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moonen
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

NOT VOTING—15

Castro (TX)
Duckworth
Fincher
Gowdy
Graves (GA)

Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Kelly (IL)
Miller (FL)

Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1727

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 69, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—236

Abraham	Griffith	Pearce
Aderholt	Grothman	Perry
Allen	Guinta	Peterson
Amash	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodi	Hardy	Pitts
Ashford	Harper	Poe (TX)
Babin	Harris	Poliquin
Barletta	Hartzler	Pompeo
Barr	Heck (NV)	Posey
Barton	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Benishek	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Bilirakis	Hill	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Huelskamp	Renacci
Black	Hultgren	Ribble
Blackburn	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Bost	Hurd (TX)	Rigell
Boustany	Hurt (VA)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Issa	Roe (TN)
Brat	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Buck	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Jones	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan	Ross
Byrne	Joyce	Rothfus
Calvert	Katko	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Royce
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Chabot	King (IA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kline	Schweikert
Cole	Knight	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	LaHood	Sessions
Comstock	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Costa	Latta	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Lipinski	Smith (MO)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Love	Stefanik
Culberson	Lucas	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Denham	Lummis	Stutzman
Dent	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Marchant	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Marino	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy	Tipton
Donovan	McCaul	Trott
Duffy	McClintock	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McMorris	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers	Walberg
Farenthold	McSally	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walker
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walorski
Fleming	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Flores	Mica	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Fox	Moolenaar	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Williams
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Womack
Gibson	Newhouse	Woodall
Gohmert	Noem	Yoder
Goodlatte	Nugent	Yoho
Gosar	Nunes	Young (AK)
Granger	Olson	Young (IA)
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Zeldin
Grayson	Paulsen	Zinke

NOES—178

Adams	Bustos	Clyburn
Aguilar	Butterfield	Cohen
Bass	Capps	Connolly
Beatty	Capuano	Conyers
Becerra	Cárdenas	Cooper
Bera	Carney	Courtney
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Cummings
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Curbelo (FL)
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Davis (CA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cicilline	Davis, Danny
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Brownley (CA)	Clay	Delaney
	Cleaver	DeLauro

DelBene	Kuster	Rangel
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Rice (NY)
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
Dold	Lee	Ruiz
Doyle, Michael F.	Levin	Ruppersberger
	Lewis	Rush
Edwards	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	Loeb sack	Sánchez, Linda T.
Engel	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Esty	Lowey	Schiff
Farr	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Schrader
Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Scott (VA)
Foster		Scott, David
Frankel (FL)		Serrano
Fudge	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Gabbard	Maloney, Carolyn	Sherman
Gallego		Sires
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Graham	Matsui	Speier
Green, Al	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
Green, Gene	McDermott	Takai
Grijalva	McGovern	Takano
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Hahn	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Hanna	Meng	Titus
Hastings	Moore	Tonko
Heck (WA)	Moulton	Torres
Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas
Himes	Nadler	Van Hollen
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Vargas
Honda	Neal	Veasey
Hoyer	Nolan	Vela
Huffman	Norcross	Velázquez
Israel	O'Rourke	Visclosky
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Walz
Jeffries	Pascrell	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Peters
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman
Keating	Pingree	Welch
Kennedy	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Kildee	Polis	Yarmuth
Kilmer	Price (NC)	
Kirkpatrick		

NOT VOTING—19

Blum	Herrera Beutler	Quigley
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Kelly (IL)	Westmoreland
Fincher	Kind	Wittman
Goody	Massie	
Graves (GA)	Mullin	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1733

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 70 on H.R. 3293, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today to attend the funeral of a family member. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 68, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 69, I would have voted "no," and on rollcall No. 70, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 68 on the Eddie Bernice Johnson Amendment for consideration of H.R. 3293—Scientific Research in the National Interest Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 69 on the Motion to recommit H.R.

3293—Scientific Research in the National Interest Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 70 on the final passage of H.R. 3293—Scientific Research in the National Interest Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY AS PART OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 111, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACARTHUR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 111

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on May 5, 2016, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES-JORDAN DEFENSE COOPERATION ACT OF 2015

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 907) to improve defense cooperation between the United States and Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of January 22, 2015, the United States Government has provided \$3,046,343,000 in assistance to respond to the Syria humanitarian crisis, of which nearly \$467,000,000 has been provided to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

(2) As of January 2015, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, there were 621,937 registered Syrian refugees in Jordan and 83.8 percent of whom lived outside refugee camps.

(3) In 2000, the United States and Jordan signed a free-trade agreement that went into force in 2001.

(4) In 1996, the United States granted Jordan major non-NATO ally status.

(5) Jordan is suffering from the Syrian refugee crisis and the threat of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(6) The Government of Jordan was elected as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council for a 2-year term ending in December 2015.

(7) Enhanced support for defense cooperation with Jordan is important to the national security of the United States, including through creation of a status in law for Jordan similar to the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Australia, the Republic of Korea, Israel, and New Zealand, with respect to consideration by Congress of foreign military sales to Jordan.

(8) The Colorado National Guard's relationship with the Jordanian military provides a significant benefit to both the United States and Jordan.

(9) Jordanian pilot Moaz al-Kasasbeh was brutally murdered by ISIL.

(10) On February 3, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry and Jordanian Foreign Minister Nasser Judeh signed a new Memorandum of Understanding that reflects the intention to increase United States assistance to the Government of Jordan from \$660,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 for each of the years 2015 through 2017.

(11) On December 5, 2014, in an interview on CBS This Morning, Jordanian King Abdullah II stated—

(A) in reference to ISIL, "This is a Muslim problem. We need to take ownership of this. We need to stand up and say what is wrong"; and

(B) "This is our war. This is a war inside Islam. So we have to own up to it. We have to take the lead. We have to start fighting back."

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It should be the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in its response to the Syrian refugee crisis;

(2) to provide necessary assistance to alleviate the domestic burden to provide basic needs for the assimilated Syrian refugees;

(3) to cooperate with Jordan to combat the terrorist threat from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) or other terrorist organizations; and

(4) to help secure the border between Jordan and its neighbors Syria and Iraq.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) expeditious consideration of certifications of letters of offer to sell defense articles, defense services, design and construction services, and major defense equipment to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) is fully consistent with United States security and foreign policy interests and the objectives of world peace and security;

(2) Congress welcomes the statement of King Abdullah II quoted in section (2)(11); and

(3) it is in the interest of peace and stability for regional members of the Global Coalition to Combat ISIL to continue their commitment to, and increase their involvement in, addressing the threat posed by ISIL.

SEC. 5. ENHANCED DEFENSE COOPERATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—During the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan shall be treated as if it were a country listed in the provisions of law described in subsection (b) for purposes of applying and administering such provisions of law.

(b) *ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.*—The provisions of law described in this subsection are—

(1) subsections (b)(2), (d)(2)(B), (d)(3)(A)(i), and (d)(5) of section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753);

(2) subsections (e)(2)(A), (h)(1)(A), and (h)(2) of section 21 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2761);

(3) subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(6), (c), and (d)(2)(A) of section 36 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2776);

(4) section 62(c)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2796a(c)(1)); and

(5) section 63(a)(2) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2796b(a)(2)).

SEC. 6. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to increase economic support funds, military cooperation, including joint military exercises, personnel exchanges, support for international peacekeeping missions, and enhanced strategic dialogue.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUDICIAL REDRESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1428) to extend Privacy Act remedies to citizens of certified states, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 4 line 21, and insert:

(d) *DESIGNATION OF COVERED COUNTRY.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, designate a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" for purposes of this section if—

(A)(i) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has entered into an agreement with the United States that provides for appropriate privacy protections for information shared for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses; or

(ii) the Attorney General has determined that the country or regional economic integration or-

ganization, or member country of such organization, has effectively shared information with the United States for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses and has appropriate privacy protections for such shared information;

(B) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, permits the transfer of personal data for commercial purposes between the territory of that country or regional economic organization and the territory of the United States, through an agreement with the United States or otherwise; and

(C) the Attorney General has certified that the policies regarding the transfer of personal data for commercial purposes and related actions of the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, do not materially impede the national security interests of the United States.

(2) *REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.*—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, revoke the designation of a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" if the Attorney General determines that such designated "covered country"—

(A) is not complying with the agreement described under paragraph (1)(A)(i);

(B) no longer meets the requirements for designation under paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

(C) fails to meet the requirements under paragraph (1)(B);

(D) no longer meets the requirements for certification under paragraph (1)(C); or

(E) impedes the transfer of information (for purposes of reporting or preventing unlawful activity) to the United States by a private entity or person.

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO VETERAN DIES ALONE

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that no veteran dies alone. Yesterday, southern Arizona proved that true in an amazing way.

Recently, Sierra Vista resident Sergeant First Class Sidney D. Cochran passed away at the age of 93. He served 20 years in the U.S. Army, serving in both World War II and Korea, but died without any family to attend his funeral. A call went out at the end of last week on social media to encourage anyone to attend his service. Over 300 people came out to show their respects.

The Sierra Vista Herald reported that American Legion Riders escorted Sergeant Cochran to the cemetery, where members of the Tucson-based Patriot Guard Riders were waiting to

greet him. Fort Huachuca's Honor Guard carried him to his final resting place, and an Arizona National Guard helicopter conducted a flyover. The manager of the cemetery remarked that she had never seen a service like that before.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud everyone in my district who took the time to give Sergeant Cochran the honor he deserved. Southern Arizona is unique for so many reasons, and not least of all is the amazing way our community shows appreciation for our veterans and their service.

CYBERSECURITY NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President announced his Cybersecurity National Action Plan in conjunction with his 2017 budget proposal. This proposal starts with a much-needed investment in Federal cybersecurity: a 35 percent increase in spending anchored by a \$3.1 billion revolving fund designed to kick-start the modernization of outdated government IT systems—something that is sorely needed.

The Action Plan is notable for its emphasis on centralizing Federal cybersecurity, something I have long called for. While the CISO created under the plan does not have all authorities I think the position requires, it is certainly a step in the right direction.

The plan also makes needed investments in workforce development, including the very successful CyberCorps program, and charters a Presidential commission to do more long-range planning in the domain.

I commend the President's effort, which reflects an appropriately strategic adjustment to the breach of Office of Personnel Management systems last year; however, I hope we will leverage this increased attention to address the challenges of tomorrow, not just those of yesterday.

IRAN VIOLATES INTERNATIONAL LAW

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was a routine exercise, sailing from Kuwait to Bahrain through the Persian Gulf, until, allegedly, the navigation system failed on one of the two U.S. gunboats. Mysteriously, the boats lost communication.

Next, 10 American sailors surrendered and were captured by Iran. They were led off the boat at gunpoint and held hostage. Iran, unsurprisingly, violated Article 13 of the Geneva Convention by failing to protect our sailors from "insults and public curiosity."

Here is a poster of our sailors surrendering to the small boat of Iranians. The bottom photograph apparently shows arms taken off the two American boats. I assume the Iranians kept those.

Iran's Supreme Leader has awarded victory medals to its navy commanders for capturing the Americans.

International law states that anyone can have innocent passage through a state's territorial waters, as long as it is nonthreatening, continuous, and expeditious.

Iran claimed the Americans were sent to spy. These claims turned out to be delusional. Iran acted without consequences, and the U.S. did not act at all.

Many questions remain. Where was the effective air cover for the Navy? Why did the sailors "give up the ship"? Who gave the order to surrender?

The Navy needs to let the American public know how two American boats were confiscated by the Iranians and why it happened.

And that is just the way it is.

FLINT WATER CRISIS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in Michigan, thousands of young children were poisoned because Governor Snyder used a contaminated water source to cut costs. Last year, in my State of New Jersey, over 3,000 children under 6 years old were afflicted with dangerous levels of lead, according to a new report.

Four of the communities I represent in Congress—Irvington, East Orange, Newark, and Jersey City—have dangerous lead levels. At the same time, our runaway Governor continues to roll back protections for clean water.

It is a national disgrace that children in New Jersey, Michigan, and other U.S. States are being poisoned by lead in the year 2016. Many of these children will suffer irreparable harm, never reaching their full potential, because of the neglect and indifference of their leaders.

We have a moral obligation to protect the health and well-being of our communities, especially our children. Let's meet it.

□ 1745

SUPPORTING THE DOLPHINS CANCER CHALLENGE AND SYLVESTER COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge south Floridians to join me at the Dolphins Cancer Challenge on Saturday, February 20.

The Dolphins Cancer Challenge raises money for the University of Miami's Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center to help "tackle cancer"—to the tune of \$11.5 million since its inception in 2010.

This event was inspired by Jim "Mad Dog" Mandich, whom we see pictured here, whom we tragically lost to cancer nearly 5 years ago.

A champion both on and off the field, the "Mad Dog" was a key contributor for the still-perfect and still-peerless, undefeated 1972 Miami Dolphins.

But Jim was perhaps best known and loved for his broadcasting work, where he cheered our own Dolphins with his patented "Alright Miami."

So please ride, run, or walk with me at the Dolphins Cancer Challenge to help support Sylvester's innovative cancer care.

MANMADE DISASTER IN FLINT, MICHIGAN

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in decrying this man-made disaster that is affecting the residents in the city of Flint, Michigan.

Every day we learn more about how the Governor and Michigan public officials made decisions that sacrificed the health and futures of the Flint residents in order to save a few dollars. That is just plain wrong. The people of Flint deserve better. We cannot stand silent while Americans, while children, are poisoned.

Flint is a majority African American city, and the average household income is just \$24,834—that is a year—which is barely half of Michigan's average household income. Would the same decisions have been made had this been in an affluent community? I doubt it.

Earlier today, this House passed the bipartisan Safe Drinking Water Act Improved Compliance Awareness Act, but we can and must do more to prevent this from ever happening again.

Our response must be comprehensive and urgent. It is a state of emergency that requires Members of Congress to find all of the Federal resources possible to demonstrate that we are really and truly our brothers' and sisters' keeper.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FY 2017 BUDGET AND CRUSHING DEBT

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this is the cover of President Obama's last budget proposal. Whether or not the administration intended it, it is a fitting and appropriate cover because it symbolizes the mountain of debt President Obama will leave behind.

His latest budget proposal increases spending by a record-breaking 4.9 percent, or \$2.5 trillion over the next decade. The President's budget leaves our

children and grandchildren burdened with an unfathomable mountain of debt, regulations, and taxes; and like every other budget he has presented, it never balances. This budget is reckless and unconscionable.

When President Obama took office on January 20, 2009, the national debt was \$10.6 trillion; yet Mr. Obama has increased the national debt to \$19 trillion, and this budget would increase our national debt to \$27.4 trillion over the next decade—more than twice the debt when he first took office.

This cover will be part of the Archives of the United States. It will be a fitting historical record for the mountains of debt it represents.

DATA COLLECTION

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, data collection affects countless Americans and touches many parts of our lives. Data collection is very personal and may include your location, photos, messages, and many of the things that make up who we are; yet we lack basic rights for data collected on mobile devices.

This week, I introduced a pair of bills to safeguard consumer privacy:

H.R. 4517, the APPS Act, will bolster consumer privacy by requiring app developers to maintain privacy policies, obtain consent from consumers before collecting data, and securely maintain the data they collect.

H.R. 4516, the Data Act, would recreate transparency and control for consumers over their personal data and provide consumers with the tools to correct the record and minimize collection.

Privacy is an issue that should unite us, not drive us apart. It is past time for our laws to reflect this reality through commonsense rules for data collection, transparency, and use.

CONGRATULATING PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE GENE DIGIROLAMO FOR RECEIVING THE 2016 DR. NATHAN DAVIS AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING GOVERNMENT SERVICE

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate State Representative Gene DiGirolamo, of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who will be honored this month with the American Medical Association's 2016 Dr. Nathan Davis Award for Outstanding Government Service, which is named for its founder.

Representative DiGirolamo's dedication to the betterment of public health through advocacy and legislative work in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives earned him this pres-

tigious award. He is presently serving in his 11th term in office and third term as chairman of the House Human Services Committee.

Representative DiGirolamo steadfastly continues his advocacy of issues related to drug and alcohol treatment and prevention, physical and intellectual disabilities, and individuals with mental illness. Additionally, he wrote legislation that increased funding for vital rehabilitation centers, while establishing a separate cabinet agency for the important effort that streamlined drug and alcohol treatment services in Pennsylvania.

Representative DiGirolamo has provided leadership to his associates and constituents and set an example for others to follow, and I am honored to call him my friend.

Congratulations, Gene.

PRESQUE ISLE STATE PARK BEACH REPLENISHMENT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I joined my colleagues—Representative MIKE KELLY from Pennsylvania's Third Congressional District, along with Pennsylvania Senators PAT TOOMEY and BOB CASEY, JR.—in sending a letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Army. In that letter, we requested that Presque Isle State Park remain a high-priority project for the Army Corps of Engineers' budget for the fiscal year 2016.

Presque Isle State Park is located along 7 miles of Lake Erie's shoreline. The park's beaches require proper care and nourishment every single year to fight their constant erosion.

More than 4 million people visit Presque Isle State Park each year, making it Pennsylvania's most visited State park. The park is woven into the social fabric of the region and is a highly important part of northwestern Pennsylvania's economy.

It is my hope that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will continue to support replenishment of this vital resource for the Erie region, preserving these beaches for future generations.

FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, we are here for another Future Forum discussion, and tonight our topic is restoring our democracy, campaign finance, and voting rights.

Americans agree, our voting system and our political system is broken, and the integrity of our democracy is at stake.

Future Forum is a House Democratic Caucus group consisting of 17 of our

youngest members who have gone across the country to 11 cities, now, talking to young people about their democracy and what they care about.

We were just in Dallas this past Friday, hosted in the Dallas/Fort Worth area by Congressman MARC VEASEY, as well as being joined by Congressman RUBEN GALLEGOS of Phoenix.

Today we are following up on what we heard in Dallas and what we have heard in many of the cities before it, which is, for all the issues facing millennials, many of them understand that, at the root of the problem is the influence of outside money in politics and access to the ballot box.

Joining us tonight is one of the leaders in the House on the issue of money and politics, Congressman JOHN SARBANES of Maryland. He is the lead sponsor of the Government By the People Act.

Also we will be joined by Congressman KILMER, from the Seattle area, and Delegate PLASKETT, from the Virgin Islands.

So I am going to first ask Congressman SARBANES this question, which we have heard from so many millennials across the country: What can we do to restore their faith in their government?

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman, Congressman SWALWELL, of the Future Forum, for convening us around issues here in the Chamber and out in the country that are particularly important and critical for the next generation out there, and what we can do to bring their interests in, bring them into the political town square, if you will, and get the benefit of their voices.

The gentleman is absolutely right to point to the challenge, the problem we have. Many young people, many Americans of all ages these days feel that their voice really isn't accounted for here in Washington. Their sense is that there is kind of an insider game being played, that big money and special interests hold particular sway in this place, and the voice of everyday Americans, average citizens, just doesn't have a place.

That has led to cynicism, it has led to anger, it has led to frustration, and it has led to a lot of people deciding to exit the political arena.

It doesn't mean they are not passionate about things. That is clearly the case. You see a lot of young people who are focused on climate change, on the economy, on jobs, on issues that are important to them. They have just kind of given up that maybe Washington and Congress are the places where important decisions and progress can be made on those issues.

So the challenge for us is: How do we bring people back? How do we get them back into the conversation so we can benefit from what a pluralistic democratic society is all about, which is, you get people in there, you tussle

around, you put your views out, you reach a compromise, and then you move forward? That is what progress is all about.

I think one of the critical ways to address this is we have got to look at re-vamping the way we fund campaigns in this country. So the gentleman is right to call attention to that, and we have a lot of leadership here in the House that is focused on what we can do to kind of restore the voices of everyday Americans.

I appreciate your citing the Government By the People Act, which is reform legislation that we have introduced in this Congress. We have almost 160 cosponsors, including, I think, everybody who is going to speak this evening as part of the Future Forum.

The idea there is just to basically go build a different way of funding campaigns that puts everyday citizens back at the center, so they are the linchpin, they are the driver, where small donations can earn matching funds and help to power the campaign of Members of Congress and candidates out there who want to run and become part of this place. There will be a place for candidates to turn to support their campaigns other than to the special interests and the big money crowd.

We can build a system like that that is viable, that puts everyday citizens at the center of it. And I think if we do that, young people and people, frankly, of all ages and stripes are going to decide they want to step back into the political space because they will feel appreciated again, like their voice matters.

□ 1800

So I look forward to the discussion tonight, and I want to thank you for your work on the Future Forum and particularly calling attention tonight to this issue of money and politics, how we address it, and how we bring the voices of everyday citizens back into the mix into the people's House.

Mr. SWALWELL. I want to again thank my colleague from the Baltimore area in Maryland.

I want to ask Congressman KILMER. The Future Forum went to Seattle. We visited college campuses in the Tacoma and Seattle area. We went to a couple of the big businesses in your area with a millennial workforce.

We heard in Tacoma the same thing that we heard when we went to the Manchester, New Hampshire, area and the same thing that we heard in the Dallas area, which is that millennials just think that the system is rigged and there is no reason to participate. The numbers show that. Roughly 22 percent of the eligible millennials showed up to vote in 2014.

What are you hearing in the Seattle area about this issue?

Mr. KILMER. I think that is pretty consistent with what we hear in our neck of the woods. You saw in the last election season two-thirds of Americans cast a no-confidence vote by not

voting at all, and those numbers are even worse when it comes to millennial voters.

I think as Mr. SARBANES said, it is not that they don't care, there are a lot of things that they care about. But it is, I think, out of a fair belief that there is too much money, too many deep pockets, and too many special interests that are driving our democracy.

This week Politico came out with a report that the 100 biggest donors of the 2016 cycle have spent \$195 million. That is more than the combined total of 2 million small donors. So I think it is fair to say that millennial voters see that dynamic and believe that their voice is getting drowned out in the process.

Mr. SWALWELL. If you look at this chart here, 158 families gave nearly 50 percent of the early 2016 donations. How does that make you feel?

If you are a part of the largest generation America has ever known, 80 million people, the most diverse generation America has ever known, how does it make you feel when 158 families are contributing over 50 percent?

Mr. KILMER. I think it drives the importance of some of the change that we are talking about here tonight. Certainly, the Government By the People Act is a key part of that, trying to get the deep pockets and special interest influence away and actually empower the everyday American and millennial voters.

There are other things we have to do as well. You see this problem exacerbated by the Citizens United decision. Many of us are cosponsors of a constitutional amendment to undo that Supreme Court decision.

You have seen efforts focused on trying to at least shine a bright light on where some of this dark money is coming from. There is a bill called the DISCLOSE Act that at least tries to focus on that issue.

Then the other thing that I have worked on is trying to put the teeth back into the watchdog of our campaign finance system. So, after Watergate, you saw the Federal Election Commission established. That was really meant to be the watchdog to make sure people weren't violating campaign finance law and that they were playing by the rules.

Unfortunately, as time has passed, the Federal Election Commission has almost become as dysfunctional as the United States Congress. The consequence of that is people are playing fast and loose with the rules.

You see the rise of super-PACs and this whole question of coordination, particularly in the Presidential campaigns, and it is a real problem. So we put forward a bill that is called the Restoring Integrity to America's Elections Act. Very simply, it tries to put teeth back into the Federal Election Commission.

So there are all sorts of things that we have got to do on this front to try to reduce the role of money in our poli-

tics and to try to restore the people's power back.

Because, if you look at some the extraordinary things that have happened in this country, whether it be the civil rights movement or advances made in environmental protection or any number of things, they have happened when everyday Americans, citizens, are able to take hold of their government and to actually make a difference in their government.

I think each of us is trying to do that, certainly from a policy standpoint. Next week I am doing seven townhall meetings in my district to try to make sure that everyday Americans have a voice in their democracy.

But you look at charts like that and I think it makes it very hard for people to feel any sense of impact and efficacy and feel like their voice is being heard. I think it is an important conversation for us to be having because we need to change that.

Mr. SWALWELL. Your proposals to have reforms with more teeth are quite popular across the country. I don't know if you knew this, but it has strong support across a cross-section of the electorate.

For example, majorities of Democratic voters, 72 percent women and 84 percent men, support small donor reforms. Independent voters, 60 percent of the women polled and 66 percent of the men polled supported it. Among Republican voters, 57 percent of the women supported it, and 53 percent of the men have supported small donor reforms.

So I want to ask Congressman SARBANES—and then I see we are now joined by Congressman VEASEY as well—how has money and politics also worked to disenfranchise voters? Because Congressman VEASEY and I heard in the Dallas/Fort Worth area about how voting laws that have been put in place have made it actually quite hard to show up and vote. We heard about the purging of people from the voter rolls.

What is the connection there when you have outside interests drowning out voices, putting in who they want as policymakers, and then the effect on the rules that go into place as far as how we govern our election?

Mr. SARBANES. You can talk about the effect on the rules. You can just also talk about the effect on the enthusiasm for voting, period.

If people are convinced that money calls the shots, then they are going to look at voting as just being asked to come out on election day and decide which of two people to send to Washington to work for somebody else.

Look at the issue of access to the ballot box and protecting access to the ballot box. Last year I had the opportunity with many Members of Congress to go down to Selma with JOHN LEWIS and remember the foot soldiers from 50 years ago who fought for the right to vote.

We talked about protecting access to the ballot box. But just as important is

protecting the ballot box' opportunity to get to Washington without being hijacked along the way.

Because that undermines the franchise, too. People bleed and sweat to get to the ballot box. You have to make sure that ballot box is preserved on its way to Washington.

So on one side of the coin, you have the right to vote, which is sacrosanct in our country. On the other side of the coin, you have the right to have your vote mean something. That is where we have to address the undue influence that money has.

Two other real quick points before I yield back.

One is—and this is important, I think, to millennials, young people, and the next generation—this question about what we do with money in politics. It is not just about putting rules in place. Rules are important.

You have got to have disclosure and transparency. You have to have non-coordination rules so the super-PACs can't talk to the candidates. You want to try and get a constitutional amendment to put limits on what the big money players can do. But rules are putting a referee on the field of the democracy to blow the whistle when the big money crowd gets out of hand.

We need the rules, but we also need power. We need to figure out a way to get Americans out of the bleachers and onto the field of their own democracy. That is what small donor matching systems of public financing are all about.

So it is about rules, but it is also about power. I think young people are leaving a lot of power on the table that they can take back to give themselves a voice in their democracy again, and they will be at the center of that kind of reform. So that is why it is so critical to push forward with all of these different measures.

Then the last thing I just wanted to point out is one of the things that happens is young people want to run for office. They want to get into the game. They want to enter politics. They want to come into the political arena.

But, unfortunately, there is something called the money primary or the green primary where, if you can't find a lot of people that can raise a lot of money for you, then you have no way to be viable as a candidate. So then you don't even put your hat into the ring.

One of the things that will happen if we can create systems of small donor public financing across the country—and we are starting to see that in places like Seattle, Maine, Arizona, Connecticut, New York City, and so forth—is that people who before could never imagine running because they couldn't raise the money because there is a system that can lift them up, they will put their hat in the ring, they will run, they will compete, they will win, and they will serve.

It will change the composition not just of Congress, but of State legisla-

tures all across the country. That is the promise of small donor reform. Then we can bring young people in here. Then we can get the benefit of their wisdom not just as donors and not just as small donors, but as candidates and public servants.

Mr. SWALWELL. Thank you again, Congressman SARBANES, for your work.

I want to empower young people across America right now, #FutureForum. There is a poll right now: Do you believe Congress should vote to update campaign finance rules? We have had over 100 responses since just posting it. Ninety percent of the people say yes.

Congressman VEASEY, we were in Dallas on Friday. We talked to hundreds of young people about what issues they care about, especially access to the ballot box.

What did you hear in Dallas?

Mr. VEASEY. Absolutely. Representative SWALWELL. I appreciate you taking your time to come out to Dallas/Fort Worth.

All the kids that were there, the college campus, the young professionals that we spoke to, the business leaders that we spoke to, really appreciated the fact that you and others in Congress are leading the effort to engage young people and to engage millennials.

They make up such a large portion of our population. They are going to continue to make up a very large portion of our population. We need to engage them to find out what it is they are thinking.

One of the things that we heard when we were in the metroplex, as we like to call Dallas/Fort Worth, is that young people feel like voting is not necessarily easy, that some of the barriers that have been put up recently in place have made it a lot harder for young people to exercise their right to vote.

One of the young people that we met talked about the fact that they had missed one election cycle, they went to go and vote, and they found out that they had been suspended from the voter file, that they had been actually purged.

Mr. SWALWELL. I remember that woman. How does she feel about that?

Mr. VEASEY. It was very discouraging for her. It makes it seem as if the system is rigged against her, and she didn't understand why that happened. That was really unfortunate.

One of the other things that I am aware of—because I am actually a plaintiff in a lawsuit to roll back the Texas voter ID law—is a lot of our young people, when they go to college, get IDs from their university. At a lot of our State universities, they will get IDs.

These IDs are good if they need to identify themselves to a campus police officer. If they need to be able to use the ID to get on a plane or anything like that, these kids can use these college IDs.

But under the Texas voter ID law, a lot of our young people, if they go back

home to vote in their home counties and they show their student ID card—a student ID card, again, that is issued by the State of Texas—they cannot vote. They will be given a provisional ballot. It won't count.

When young people hear things like that, it really discourages them from voting. So we need to do everything we can to engage young people.

One of the things that I hear, Representative SWALWELL, from a lot of young people is that—for instance, the young lady that we met that was purged from the voter roll—if there were same-day registration—actually, same-day registration actually encourages young people to participate in voting.

But a lot of States, like the one that I live in, won't do things like that. They won't take that initiative. They won't take that extra effort to engage young people.

It is no wonder that so many of our young people feel like the system is really rigged against them, that, if they vote, their vote really won't count. It is really, really unfortunate.

I would really think that, in the wake of the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act, there is really no better time to assure young voters that they can play a pivotal role in our democracy and to continue to urge them, despite what a lot of States like mine are doing, to really discourage them from voting and discriminate against them, that they will continue to take part in help shaping America. The best way how you can do that is by voting.

Mr. SWALWELL. We talked to a lot of innovative young people in Dallas. If I have learned anything about young people—and I remember being up in Manhattan with Congressman ISRAEL and Congresswoman GRACE MENG.

We were at a district co-workspace. The complaint we often heard there was just about how darn hard it is to get to the polls and why is it on a Tuesday. Why is it so inconvenient.

I want to have Delegate PLASKETT speak to us on voting rights as well, but in a moment I'm going to have STEVE ISRAEL talk to us about weekend elections because people on Twitter right now are asking: Why can't we have votes on the weekend?

Delegate PLASKETT, can you talk to us a little bit just about voting rights with respect to the Virgin Islands, but also what you are hearing among young people.

Ms. PLASKETT. Thank you so much for putting this together for us to be able to speak to the American people and speak to this body about voting rights, its importance, and the difficulties, that many groups are feeling disenfranchised from the voting system.

The Voting Rights Act is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that this Congress has put forward. It was passed in 1965 to prohibit discrimination in voting.

According to the Department of Justice, the Voting Rights Act itself has

been called the single most effective piece of civil rights legislation. That was back in 2009 when they said that.

The Department of Justice has had a history of blocking racial gerrymandering, which was covered in section 4 of the act. In 2006, the Voting Rights Act was reaffirmed by an act of this Congress.

The Senate voted for it 98-0, and the House voted 390-33 in favor of the Voting Rights Act, which lets us know that this is a fundamental right that most Americans believe.

□ 1815

But there are still these barriers that many groups feel. I know, Congressman SWALWELL, you have gone around the country. You have heard from young people, you have heard from poor people, you have heard from those who live in rural areas, the difficulty they have in exercising this fundamental right.

In the Virgin Islands, we are facing an even greater constitutional issue that we are bringing court cases to the United States about. Many years ago, Congress decided that the right to vote was not a fundamental right for people that were living in the territories.

Under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizen Absentee Voting Act, if you live in the United States in any of the 50 States, if you decide to move to Paris, if you decide to move to Timbuktu, you can still vote. But if you decide that you are going to live in one of the United States territories, you have given up that right to vote for your President in your Federal election. In places like Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, we have the highest veteran rate per capita in the United States. In the Virgin Islands, we have the highest casualty rate per capita of people who have volunteered to serve this country, but cannot vote for their Commander in Chief.

We are bringing case law—and I am part of an effort—to ensure that people who decide to live in the Virgin Islands, who are from the Virgin Islands, can retain that right to exercise their voice in our Federal elections and not something that we are fighting for right now.

This goes along with many of the other what we believe to be historic discrimination that has gone on. There is an enormous amount of racial gerrymandering that is happening in this country. The great Mr. JOHN LEWIS, our colleague, has issued H.R. 12, I believe it is, which is a bill to expand voting rights and the ability for people to vote.

I know that as you go around this country and you speak with people, Representative SWALWELL, you will hear about the difficulties, particularly those people who are discriminated against in many ways, from their ability to vote.

One of the things that I recall writing about when I was in law school was

individuals who have been incarcerated and the ability that they no longer have to vote. We know that in the Black community there is a disproportionate amount of our young men and women who are incarcerated and then have lost their right to vote. The difficulties they have reinstating that right and that ability to vote absolutely excludes not only their dignity and their ability to voice their opinions, but they are feeling part of the American Dream, feeling included in this American mission. What message are we saying to them when they need to be reintegrated back into this country and to be productive citizens that they can work, we want them to work, we want them to do everything that they are supposed to do, but they cannot have that fundamental right to vote.

These are the things that I am glad you are speaking about tonight and that you are making the American public available to. I don't know what the Twitter feed is working on right now, but I am hoping that people will tweet about this and will get this word out and will really create an echo chamber of young people, and even those who are not young, who are concerned about millennials and concerned about the next generation being able to be a part of the American process.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank Delegate PLASKETT. That was so eloquently said.

On Twitter right now under the #futureforum, people are speaking about their democracy and their right to access the polls. Anna Little-Sana tweeted: Election day should be a Federal holiday! Kel tweeted: Elections on Saturdays sounds like the easiest and least controversial solution.

Congressman ISRAEL, what if someone introduced the Weekend Voting Act? Wait, someone has, and he is here.

Mr. ISRAEL. What a coincidence.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Tell us about that.

Mr. ISRAEL. What a coincidence this is.

I want to thank my friend from California for his leadership in the Future Forum, traveling the country, engaging young people and millennials on the critical issue of participating in government. I don't qualify as a millennial.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. It is a mind-set.

Mr. ISRAEL. I am slightly older than most of the audiences that you engage. But I used to be a millennial. I used to be a young person. I grew up in Levittown, New York, on Long Island. I remember going to public school at Gardiners Avenue Elementary School and being taught civics, being taught what it takes to be a good citizen, and what our responsibilities and obligations were.

The principal responsibility and the principal obligation of a good citizen was voting. You could vote to the left,

you could vote to the right, but vote. Now we are falling further and further behind on voting because it has become harder and harder.

There is a particular Republican candidate who talks about how we have to make America great again. Do you know what we are not so great at? We are not so great at voting. In fact, we are falling further and further behind the rest of the industrialized world. We are falling further and further behind most democracies in our voting participation.

Why is that well? One reason is because we reserve one day of the year to vote in Federal elections, and that is Tuesday. I don't know if my friend knows—here is a little history quiz, a little pop quiz, to put him on the spot: Why do we vote on that Tuesday? Do you have any idea why we vote on that Tuesday?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I don't have the slightest clue, no. Why do we?

Mr. ISRAEL. Here is the answer. In 1845, Congress decided that voting day would be on Tuesday in November. Why? Because at the time we were living in a mostly agrarian society, we were a farm economy, and Sunday was the Lord's day. The polling places were usually in the county seat, so Monday was the day that you traveled to the county seat. You got to your county seat on Tuesday, you cast your vote, you returned on Wednesday, and you farmed on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. That may have made sense in 1845, but it doesn't make the same sense in 2016.

As a result of reserving this one Tuesday as voting day, most Americans report that they didn't vote because they just couldn't vote on Tuesday. Some people have two jobs, three jobs, and they are raising families. As important as it is to be a good citizen and to cast their vote, they are finding it harder and harder.

The solution is very simple. I am going to make another quick comment. The solution is very simple. Allow people to vote on weekends. Designate Saturday and Sunday for voting. You can do it on a Saturday; you can do it on a Sunday. But we ought to designate weekend voting.

There are other democracies in the world, other nations in the world, that have weekend voting, and their voting participation is much higher than ours.

If there is one thing the government should do to make it more convenient for middle class citizens and working families, it is make it more convenient to vote, and we can do that on weekends.

Let me make one other point if I could. I made a decision that I would not run for reelection. My decision was based on a broad range of personal issues and personal considerations, personal desires, to do other things. I have been here for 16 years. It is time to pass the torch.

But I will tell you what. One of the factors was that I could not stand to

spend one more day asking one more donor for one more dollar.

We have a system that used to be dysfunctional. Now it is not dysfunctional. It is just beyond broken. It is a system that tells people around the country that their voices are drowned out. There is a sense—particularly among the young people that you have engaged across this country—that the only way you get heard in this place is if you have a super-PAC or a registered lobbyist with you. Most middle class families and most young people can't afford a super-PAC or a registered lobbyist.

I am concerned that we have a majority right now that has made Congress a gated community. We need to bring down those gates. The way to bring down those gates is to pass campaign finance reform; it is to pass the DISCLOSE Act, which Democrats passed when we had the majority, requiring that people know who are funding elections; that we pass weekend voting so it is easier for people to cast their votes and choose their democracy, so that their democracy is not chosen by literally a few hundred families, by passing something that our colleague, JOHN SARBANES, talked about earlier: citizen-funded elections.

If you want a stake in democracy and if you want to own democracy, you should have a share in that democracy. We ought to be encouraging citizen-funded elections, which are being done in States across the country—Republican states, Democratic States. They are embracing citizen-funded elections. We should be doing the same thing.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. You wrote a New York Times op-ed on this that was very frank, very passionate, and I think, for a lot of people, very disturbing to hear how much time Members of Congress have to spend fundraising.

I just want to ask you as you start your parting tour, which I am very sad to see, but have you met a single colleague in this Chamber on either side—left or right—who told you that they came here because they enjoyed raising money, or that that is the most enjoyable part, or anywhere close to the most enjoyable part of their job?

Mr. ISRAEL. No. In fact, I did write a piece in the New York Times that went viral. I received responses on both sides of this aisle—on both sides—people saying: You are right, we spend too much time in call time. Instead of thinking about issues, instead of thinking about a robust foreign policy that is going to defeat our enemies, we spend too much time trying to figure out a robust fundraising policy to get reelected. Both sides of the aisle said that.

Not one of our colleagues enjoy fundraising. But, in my view, there is only one party who is willing to do something about it. Pass the DISCLOSE Act, support campaign finance reform, demand transparency.

The only way we are going to take this government back and make Amer-

ica great again is to engage voters across the spectrum by lowering the barriers that exist in this place. That is going to require the DISCLOSE Act, citizen-funded elections, greater transparency, and weekend voting.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. Both sides from my experience acknowledge this problem, but only the majority has the ability to bring this up for a vote on these reforms.

I always have the sense that we can all smell the burning and the smoke in this House, but the fire alarm is on this side of the Chamber. Until our colleagues are willing to pull it and bring these issues to this floor, we are going to see millennials continue to think that the system is rigged. It is not going to be any surprise when they show up again at 20 to 25 percent at the polls.

In your district in Long Island, young people, what do they think when they see all this money in politics, that they are the largest generation in America, yet 158 families contributed over 50 percent so far in the 2016 Presidential cycle? What do you hear from them as far as whether that makes them want to engage or participate?

Mr. ISRAEL. I am very fortunate because I represent a district in New York that is blessed with universities and colleges. We have a wonderful infrastructure of university and college campuses, and I toured those campuses and heard what you have heard: Congressman, my voice doesn't count. Congressman, why should I vote when it makes no difference? Congressman, why should I get involved in a campaign when my \$20 contribution, or my \$3 contribution, gets drowned out by one billionaire who is writing checks for millions of dollars for the candidate that he supports?

I have said to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, it is bad for all of us when an entire generation gives up on us. That is just bad for democracy. That is bad for trying to accomplish anything.

I have also said—and people understand this, I believe, intuitively—no matter what issue is important to you, no matter what it is—more investments in education or infrastructure or national security or your paycheck or the environment—no matter what it is, it is all rooted in a system that doesn't allow progress on those issues because it is rigged against progress on those issues.

People say: Well, what can we do? What is the one thing we can do to get our voice back? Get this Congress to pass fundamental and meaningful campaign reform and we will make progress on every other issue.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I will never forget at one of our townhalls when we were in the Boston area. The students were listing their concerns from climate change and the inaction they have seen there, to student loan debt and how it has them in financial quicksand. To my surprise—and then I

ended up seeing this on every campus we visited—this particular student said: But, yeah, you are not going to solve any of that because the system is rigged. As long as that is the perception, which we experience as our own reality, we won't see progress on those issues.

We owe it to that generation. It is sad for you to acknowledge that a whole generation is about to give up on us until we change the way that we not only have rules for money and politics, but the way that we govern and represent our constituents, not outside corporate interests.

We have a Future Forum event coming up in Denver. It is going to be in April, hosted by Congresswoman DEGETTE and Congressman POLIS.

I will give you, Congressman ISRAEL, the last word on this evening's Future Forum focusing on voting rights and campaign financial reform.

□ 1830

Mr. ISRAEL. Again, I thank the gentleman so much for his leadership.

If you would allow an aging 57-year-old to attend the Future Forum meetings, I would be happy to do so. I will bring my crutch, my cane, and all of the other things that I need.

On a serious note, I really do want to commend you for the work that you are doing, for the engagement. Through this engagement, you are giving people hope. You are letting people know that there are people who are listening to them. You go to those events without a super-PAC. You go to those events without billionaire donors. You are representing the best that the grassroots has to offer. I want to thank you for that.

Leave people with a sense of hope. For as long as we are talking on this floor about these issues, there is hope that something will be done on this floor on these issues, and the middle class and young people and millennials will make progress again.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICA'S MANDATORY AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are actually doing something a little different tonight. We have brought about 15 to 20—what we will call—boards. If we were in a more electronic age, they would be PowerPoints.

We will have a couple of our brothers and sisters here, hopefully, from the Republican side to help us walk through some of these numbers and what they actually mean. We want to talk about what is really going on fiscally, mathwise. I am sure it was riveting reading for Members of this body;

but 3 weeks ago, on a Wednesday—so 3 weeks ago today—the CBO issued a new report. When you go through the numbers of the reality of what is going on, it is devastating.

The reality is that, unless this body engages in activities and policy and we have a President who is willing to work with us who dramatically improves economic growth and not just for a year but for the next couple of decades, there is not enough revenue to cover the entitlement promises we have made. I know that is sort of inflammatory to say, but we are going to actually walk through a series of the boards and sort of explain what is really going on.

For someone who is actually out there who may have an interest in understanding what is happening, this is the CBO report from 3 weeks ago. What makes this one so different from any other report that has happened is that we have two major entitlement programs that run out of money—that go bankrupt—within the 10-year window.

For years, you would see people walk up to these microphones and say: A decade or two from now, such and such is going to happen—30 years, 25 years from now. It is no longer decades. It is now. We are going to show you a couple of portions of the data where, in 20 months, Social Security itself goes negative, meaning the interest income that we pay ourselves—and we pay ourselves 3.1 percent in interest income from the money that the general fund has reached over and taken out of the Social Security trust fund, and the tax revenues from Social Security do not cover the money going out the door. This was not supposed to happen.

When I first got here 5 years ago, it was a decade away. Then, in some of the reports, it was 5 years. Now it is 20 months away.

We need to understand, when we talk about the desperate need for economic growth, it is jobs; it is people's futures; it is their retirements; it is also the ability to support and pay for and finance the promises this government has made—the earned benefits and—let's face it—some of the unearned benefits that are out there and our ability to pay for them. So let's actually walk through some of the boards and sort of explain where we are. This is really, really important, and you are going to hear me say that over and over as we do this.

This is the 2016 budget as we have it today. Do you see what is in blue—that bluish purple? That is what we call mandatory spending. That is Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, ObamaCare—the new healthcare law—and a handful of other poverty support programs, but it is mandatory. It is all formula driven. You will notice it is 70 percent of our spending in the fiscal year we are in—this year. The red—that 30 percent—is what we call discretionary. That is what we get to vote on around here. Half of that discretionary

is defense. When you hear politicians or public policy analysts or budget analysts talk, if they are not talking about the mandatory spending, they are missing, basically, three-quarters of our spending. Understand its rate of growth is squeezing out everything else.

If you are someone out there who cares about healthcare research or education or the parks, the resources for those activities in this government are shrinking and shrinking and getting squeezed and getting squeezed, and it is because of the movement of mandatory spending.

We have this thing called baby boomers. The fact of the matter is that baby boomers began to retire about 3 years ago, and there are about—what?—76 million of them who will retire in an 18-year period, and they do consume tremendous amounts of resources that we have failed to set aside for their futures.

Mr. Speaker, I just changed the boards. As we continue, the board that is up right now, for those folks who would be interested, is actually where the money is going today. My friend from Pennsylvania and I are going to talk through some of the mechanics here; but Social Security today is 22 percent of the spending; Medicare is 17; Medicaid is nine; other spending—that would be Section 8, SNAP, and other things that are mandatory spending that are in the formula—is another 17 percent.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Arizona.

When I start my townhall meetings, I always start with our fiscal situation because people ask me—and I imagine it is the same in your district—what is wrong with you people in Washington? Why can't you get along? What is all the bickering about? That slide is instructive because I explain to them that nearly 70 percent of the budget we don't discuss at all, and it keeps getting smaller—the things that they kind of associate with the Federal Government—because, in their minds, these other things, the things you talked about—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, care for our veterans, the ACA—all just happens automatically, and they think about—oh, I don't know—the IRS, the Park Service, the military. I keep telling them that it gets smaller, and so we squabble more over this diminishing pie.

I just need you to clarify something. So you say it is formula driven. That makes sense to you, and it makes sense to me.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. But can you make that easy for a layman?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You and I have both had this experience because we talked about it earlier. You get asked at our townhalls and at other gath-

erings: Why do you fight with each other? It is like other families—it is about the money.

When I stand here and say it is formula driven, what happens is, when you turn 65, you are eligible for certain earned benefits. When you turn 67, there are certain earned benefits. If you fall below a certain income, there are certain things you can receive. They are based on a formula whether it be your age, whether it be your income, whether it be your military service. That formula becomes sort of sacrosanct around here, and there is an inability to say, if we do these tweaks, we can preserve this benefit for future generations or even, as you are going to see in some of these numbers—and I don't know if you have had this experience in your townhalls where the political class before us used to say, "This is for your grandkids." Then, after a few years, it was for your kids—and now?

Mr. PERRY. It is for my mother, who is already on Social Security, and it is definitely for me and for anybody who thinks he may collect Social Security, understanding that, when we say "entitlements," that is not meant to be you are entitled to it. Do you know why you are entitled to it?—because the government forced you to pay into it. They forced you to invest when it comes to Social Security, right? They forced you to invest. It might not be a good investment, but you must invest. It is important, and I think you are going to talk about this a little bit in the future of how that investment is going.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. As we do this, we probably should make the distinction between an earned benefit and an entitlement and those, but, for right now, we are going to somewhat refer to them as "mandatory spending."

Mr. PERRY. Sure.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We could actually break down all of the programs, but this is already a little geeky as it is because we are going to be talking about numbers that are in the billions and trillions, and people's eyes glaze over when you talk about that. It means zeros. Yet what is really, really important here is understanding the pattern of what is going on and how quickly these numbers are eroding.

One of the reasons for this board here is, as we talk about this Congressional Budget Office report, some of the erosion in our fiscal situation is because of our lack of economic growth and of our failure to reform, repair, preserve a lot of these very programs we are talking about.

There is this slide here. This is 2026. Understand, in 9 years, mandatory spending, earned benefits, and other types of entitlements are going to have increased over those 9 years 83 percent in spending. What you and I get to vote on of military and other discretionary—the Park Service, the EPA, education, health, medical research—that will have grown 22 percent. That

is over 10 years. So think of this. What we would consider discretionary will grow about what we expect inflation to be, and that is how it has been budgeted. It is meant to basically be flat on purchasing power but where the entitlements grow dramatically.

Mr. PERRY. Because of the formula.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Formula and—we have to be brutally honest—demographics.

Mr. PERRY. Right, and the population growth for those people who will be receiving benefits.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes.

Look, this isn't a sinister plot. I can remember, back in 1981 or in 1982, sitting in a statistics class, and the professor at that time was actually showing how much money had to be set aside because the baby boomers eventually were going to turn 65. Though, as you have found here in Congress, it is almost as if we have just recently discovered that.

Mr. PERRY. We have a tendency in Congress—quite honestly, we have a tendency as Americans—with our domestic and foreign policy, to just pretend that these things aren't happening.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes.

There are a number of times you and I have folks who come to our offices or to our townhalls who have great ideas, and they desperately want some more resources for this research project or for this activity or for this infrastructure or for this and that. You try to explain—okay—this board here talks about the next 9 years; so from this budget year—where we are right now working on the 2017 budget—for the next 9 years. I know that seems like a long time, but the average over that time—76 percent of all of the spending, three-quarters of all of the spending—is going to be in those mandatory: the formula, the entitlements, the earned benefits. Only 24 percent of the spending is going to be in the military or in other activities of government.

As we go back to make that circle again, why do we fuss with each other around here? It is about the money when you have someone standing in front of you and he is not talking about the need to do two things. Now, they are big things. One is to dramatically adopt policy that grows the economy. We are not going to make it under this current growth rate. This Obama economy is just killing us. Number two, we are going to have to be honest about the benefits that we provide and the formulas underlying them. There may be some creative things we can do, but as the political class, we have got to stop being terrified to talk about it.

Mr. PERRY. What are the consequences of not doing that?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, we are going to get to that slide.

Do you plan to live more than 9 years?

Mr. PERRY. I sure hope so. My kids hope so.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You are incredibly fit. Understand, I am going to show you some slides under the new projections by the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, that came out 3 weeks ago.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, Social Security, the trust fund has about 14 years, but Medicare part A is gone in about 9 years. You are going to see Social Security disability may have only about 58 months, and that trust fund is gone again. So understand how fast these things are eroding.

Look, we are going through a lot of data and a lot of slides. I know you and I and a couple of other Members, we are going to be putting this deck of slides on our Web sites. For anyone that is actually interested in the fiscal sanity and health of this country, this is the ability to take a look at them, analyze them, give us suggestions, and give us creativity.

This one right here, so, in 2026, think of this: only 22 percent of the spending will be in what you and I get to vote on. Half of that is going to be defense; half of that is going to be nondefense.

Oh, and by the way, the one good thing I can tell you about we are getting from the slow-growth economy right now is we have reprojected our interest rate. Because if I had shown this slide a few months ago, we were expecting trillion-dollars-plus interest. Now, we only expect a much lower mean interest rate 9 years from now. So only 12 percent of our spending will be interest coverage.

Think of that. Interest will be greater than defense in 9 years. Interest will be greater than all discretionary spending in 9 years—and substantially so. So the growth you are going to see here is functionally in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, and some of the other programs. This is where we are at.

You try having a conversation with our constituents and say these are big numbers, they are huge programs. You have got to move away from some of the political folklore.

We should actually, as we go through these—because I have a couple of spots. How many times have you been at your townhall meeting and someone raises their hand? Some of the suggestions they have to save money are wonderful, but they are tiny.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. They want to cut something.

Why do you spend money on—I don't know. They call them Obama funds. Or why do you spend money on foreign aid? If we just cut that, we don't have to pay for people to hate us. They will hate us for free. It all sounds all well and good, except you can cut all that completely and—I think you will show at some point—it won't make a dent. It won't even begin to make a dent.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, those of us on the right who are more

conservative—we have our folks who are guilty of this, and, heaven knows, I see it from our friends on the left—where we hold up a shiny object and pretend like this would take care of this fiscal cliff that is no longer very far in the future. It is here. We say, oh, if we would just adjust this on foreign aid, we would be fine. Anyone who says something like that, they don't own a calculator.

So the slide next to us right now—and the gentleman and I were working on this earlier today. I thank the gentleman and his staff for their willingness to sit there and, shall we say, geek out with calculators, budgets, and actuarial tables.

One of the things that has happened—about every 3 months, I do one of these presentations. If someone were ever to go back a few years when we did the very first one, parts of these numbers have actually gotten much worse. Even though we are supposedly out of the recession and we are supposed to be in a healthier economy, as we keep being told from the other side, the fiscal, the financial shape of the country is worse.

How is that possible?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make the argument that when we do examine what we were telling folks our financial situation was in the future, it is actually much worse. In 2011 we said, hey, when we finally get to that year 2016, we are going to have 3.3 percent GDP. Then we had a couple of crazy ones that said, in 2012 and '13, you are going to be at 4½ or 4.4 percent GDP growth. You are going to be blowing the wheels off.

Then in 2014, it started to come down. Well, you are going to be at 3.4 percent GDP growth. The problem is that the latest update on our numbers, we are down to 2.3 percent GDP growth. So we are half of what we were telling the public we were going to have just a couple of years ago.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. More importantly, for this illustration, it is as important that we were telling the public—because the CBO projection told us that it was going to be 4.5, 4.4, but we were basing all our estimates on those numbers. We are basing our estimates on those numbers, and those numbers turned out to be true to the point that it is not even 2.3. It is more like 2.1, currently. It is even less than that.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. As you know, the first quarter of this budget year—because budget years aren't the same as calendar years—came in at 0.7. So we didn't even make a full percentage point of gross domestic product growth.

Once again, this is geeky and people's eyes are glazing over. Why this is important is because that economic growth is what helps create the jobs and the trade and the velocity in the economy, and that velocity ends up creating the tax revenues and the revenues that get paid into Medicare, get

paid into Social Security, help us pay and cover our promises.

What happens if you keep saying the check is out the door but you don't have the revenues? That is why it is important to pay attention to what we do in tax policy over this coming year, what we do in regulatory policy over this coming year, when we start to take on those factors that grow the economy.

I would think this would be both our friends from the left, who thought somehow we could regulate ourselves into prosperity, would see the folly of their policies and see it in the numbers and be willing to come our direction. Because do they care about saving Social Security? Do they care about saving Medicare? Do they care about saving Social Security disability? If they truly care, we have got to do something about economic growth.

I want to switch up a couple of the boards and just sort of walk through some of the different numbers here and have this make more sense. Do you have the table that actually shows the change from 2022 to 2018?

Remember, the last board I was showing you that was talking about, hey, here is what happens when we miss all these GDP numbers? This is why, on occasion, I desperately wish more of our brothers and sisters around this body would grab a CBO like this and actually read it and highlight it and pull out their calculators and look at it again. Yes, you are going to fall asleep two or three times when you do it, but you will understand how incredibly important some of the policy sets are we are making here.

This was just from when the trust funds' actuaries did their report this last summer. We will just go down to the bottom line because that is the punch line.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Arizona confirm for the audience or explain what OASI and DI mean?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. When you see something that says OASI, that means "Old Age, Survivors Insurance." That is Social Security. That is Social Security.

DI, think of it is as Social Security disability.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. You lose your job from unemployment, but you get hurt and you can't work?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. A permanent injury that changes your ability to support yourself.

As you know, this last fall, fall of 2015, it was to be out of money right now.

We bailed it out, but we bailed it out in a fairly dodgy fashion. Let's be brutally honest. We reached over into big Social Security, took \$114 billion and handed it over here. All we bought was 5 years of fiscal survivability.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. So you took \$114 billion out of OASI, which is the big Social Security?

We took it out of that and put it into disability insurance because disability was going to be bankrupt while we stand here today?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Right. Right now.

My calculations are we shortened the life of Social Security's trust fund by about 13 months when we did that. I don't think you voted for it. I don't think I did. I know I didn't. Now we have to deal with the realities of what that meant.

As we were looking before, what happens when you are not achieving the economic growth that is required? All of a sudden, you see numbers like this. And this is stunning. When you are talking about a huge trust fund, this should not be happening.

This is to give you a sense of how dramatic the problem is out there in this economy. I know we are happy talking. It is an election year and President Obama needs to sort of tell a story of how wonderful it is, but it isn't showing up on the map.

So this last August, the trustees of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security—they all do their individual reports. The Social Security trustee said interest income and tax revenues would cover the payments going out the door on Social Security until 2022, except for the small problem of, somehow between August and 3 weeks ago when we got this new updated report, it is down to 2018. Now, all of a sudden, Social Security goes negative, meaning it doesn't have enough revenues to cover its obligations.

So the way we were doing the math is, in 20 to 22 months, Social Security is going to have to start reaching over and cash in some of its bonds. We pay ourselves 3.1 percent interest in the washing machine where the general fund has reached over to the Social Security trust fund, taken the money, and loaned it to our debt.

This is devastating. If any of you have ever been in business or finance, when you start to use up principal, you are in real trouble.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. So we lost 4 years. What caused losing 4 years?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It is a combination of economy, growth rate, reaching over and taking \$114 billion out to shore up Social Security disability, and our recalculation of what future GDP is.

Just for the fun of it, can I talk my friend from South Carolina into joining us, A, because it is always entertaining when you get behind a microphone, and, B, you have no hesitation to correct me when I get math wrong.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Well, anything for fun, Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina and I have talked about these charts before, and the reality of this should terrify people how fast these numbers are eroding. Where is the conversation? Why isn't it a headline? Why isn't it on business news every night?

If I came to you and said you just lost 4 years of actuarial soundness on a trust fund that today is \$2.8 trillion, you have got to understand the scale we are talking about.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. The real frustrating thing about it, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, is that the demographic group that you would hope would be engaged in this topic isn't. When you go home and you and I and Mr. PERRY talk to our folks back home, who is most interested in Social Security? The folks who are already at or near retirement.

You have got another graph, by the way, that shows who really should be interested in this because you have got the first year outgoing exceeds income, including interest. On another graph, you show when the trust fund goes to zero for Social Security.

The last time I had the CBO run the numbers, it was roughly 2032. In fact, it was July of 2032. Why do I remember this? It is the month that I turn 65 years old. It should be our generation. It should be the people in their thirties, forties, and fifties who are demanding that we make this a topic of conversation, and they don't.

They are not demanding it right now in the Presidential election. They are not demanding it in their congressional elections. They are more concerned about other things that I get the importance, as Mr. PERRY does, of national defense and immigration. I get all that.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. How do you and I and Mr. PERRY help the public understand these numbers in the background are driving much of our policy here, much of the fussing here, but yet it is not part of the Presidential campaign, and this is no longer about your grandkids? This no longer about your kids. It is about you retire—you turn 65 in what year?

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. 2032.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You will be happy to know that my math is Social Security will have been emptied out 2 years before you retire. I mean, it is 14 years from now. So these are just critical.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Yet it is not our generation. It is Mr. BUCK's generation, the gentleman from Colorado, the older generation, the next generation who is paying closer attention to it.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am not going there.

Let's walk through a couple of the other trust funds because I know this is

really exciting, but this is important. This is the 10,000-pound gorilla in the room. So often those of us, as Members of Congress, we get behind these microphones and we do the shiny object type of discussion.

This is it. This is going to decide what our military capability is because it is what we can afford. This is going to decide what money we have for medical research and education. This is it. These numbers are incredibly important. If this doesn't drive us this year to start moving forward on tax reform, on regulatory reform, things that will start to kick-start economic growth, these numbers are devastating.

□ 1900

Let's do a little quick discussion about Medicare part A. If I came to you right now and said: "Hey, what was so devastating in this Congressional Budget Office report? What should have scared you out of your mind?", in here it basically for the very first time said one of the major trust funds is out of money in the 10-year window.

Mr. PERRY. Ten years.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Look at this. If you plan to be around 9 years from now, Medicare part A, what covers your hospital, those types of section in Medicare, it is gone. The trust fund is gone.

So all of a sudden now are we willing to do what Speaker RYAN has talked about for years, premium support, some way to reform the way we price and cost and the benefits we receive and how we allocate them and price theory, you know, sort of thinking like an economist, but things that make sure you get your earned benefit, but we also make it sustainable?

It is no longer a theoretical conversation for decades from now. It is in 9 years. So if you plan to live for 9 more years, understand, Medicare part A, the trust fund, is gone.

In our calculations in our office, it could be 30 percent cut in what is able to be paid out. How many medical professionals are willing to see you when you come in and say that you need your cataract done, you need a heart valve, you need this and, oh, by the way, the hospital is only going to be paid 30 percent less what it gets today? Are they still going to see you? Do you understand the wall we are going to be putting our seniors in? This happens in 9 years.

How many Presidential candidates have you seen or heard talk about this? Mr. PERRY. I haven't seen any talk about that.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. So now let's talk about the other trust fund that was in the Congressional Budget Office report, something we shored up this last fall. You remember how we did it? We reached over and grabbed \$114 billion out of Social Security, old-age survivors, and moved it over to Social Security disability.

In the discussions around here, people were happy. They were applauding.

I thought we had fixed it for years. Remember there were going to be some reforms and some of these things? Well, these numbers are with the reforms and with the money, and it is gone in 58 months.

MICK, I am going to make you stand up again because you were one of the most articulate in talking about the scale of reforms we had. Both were just, in the modern economy, were there ways we could help our brothers and sisters who are on Social Security disability move back into at least some economic participation and not have them hit a cliff where all of a sudden their benefits are cut off.

It might cost us a little bit for a couple years, but in the future it would become more sustainable. We didn't do it. Now we are back on the treadmill again.

Mr. MULVANEY. I have got a question for you. While we are preparing that question, if the young man could put up the previous graph below, that one that shows the status of the Medicare trust fund.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It is stunning to think, in 9 years, Social Security disability—

Mr. MULVANEY. Put them so we can see both of them at the same time, please.

That is stunning. So between 2021 and 2025, we are going to have the Social Security disability fund go broke—

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes.

Mr. MULVANEY. And Medicare part A go broke.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Correct.

Mr. MULVANEY. Last time we fixed the Social Security disability—I am making the air quotations when I say fixed disability—by robbing from old-age retirement.

Where are we going to rob from the next time when we have both Medicare and Social Security disability going bust within a couple of months of each other?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Look, the ultimate driver for all of these trust funds, for everything around us, would be incredibly robust economic growth. Math problem.

Mr. MULVANEY. What are the assumptions on this, by the way?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, no. We are working on those tables because it turns out to be much more complicated. A couple years ago, when we were pretending we would hit 2016 and be at 4½ percent GDP growth, if you hit that number and could hold it, we were going to be okay.

Mr. MULVANEY. How many times, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, have we held 4½ percent growth for, say, a decade?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I don't think it has ever been done, ever.

Mr. MULVANEY. I think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. In this environment, in the fourth quarter of last year, which is the first quarter of our fiscal year, we were at, what, 0.7?

Mr. MULVANEY. As this year stands, it looks like now, when they re-

vised the last quarter's numbers, which they will do here shortly, 2015 will be the tenth year in a row without 3 percent growth in the American economy.

If that turns out to be the case and we go 10 years without 3 percent growth during any of that decade, it will be the first time in the history of the Nation that that has happened.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. And then you try to have the conversation with our friends from the left saying: You don't think the regulatory state affects us? You don't think raising taxes has slowed down the economy?

There is some actual great literature—and we are working on it for a future presentation—that says, for the tax hikes that the President demanded a couple years ago that this body did, for every dollar of new revenues that came in, a dollar was lost in economic growth.

It got us nothing. It basically slowed down our economic growth into the future, ultimately costing us billions. In a couple of these programs, if you really lay it out over 30 years, it could be in the trillions.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, I see you brought up the graph for the Social Security trust fund. Have you explained what the nature of the trust fund is?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. No, I haven't. I may let you do that. Let me just pitch what this one means.

In 2011, when I first got here and I started this project in our office, we actually set up a little team in our office we call the ideas shop. We actually grind out these numbers all the time, and we watch them like a hawk.

We actually do something fun. When the trustee reports come out, we sit there with our yellow highlighters and read them as a group. The amazing thing is I have almost no staff turnover, which I can't figure out why they stay.

I hear some of my staff laughing in the background.

Mr. MULVANEY. No. That is us, actually.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. In 2011, this was the chart. I just want you to look. What is the direction? The trust fund was supposed to grow and grow and grow up until 2021.

There was going to be more money there every year. This is what we were telling ourselves, telling the public, telling the financial markets just 5 years ago.

Now take a look when we look at the new budget projection. And understand we went from saying these trust funds are going to grow.

So when you and I first got here, I think the Social Security trust fund was supposed to survive to 2038, and now we have taken 8 or 9 years off that. This is the new number that just came out in the report, that, in 22 months, it starts to go negative and we start to dip into the principal balance.

In 14 years—and you will see that in the next chart because in the next one

I take it beyond the 10-year projection because we had to do our own calculations for the final 4 because they only give you 10 years when they do the projections—in 14 years, the trust fund is gone.

Look, I know you have talked about how the trust fund works.

Mr. MULVANEY. Yeah. The trust fund is actually fairly simple. A lot of people think that it doesn't exist. They think it is a myth. It is real.

What it represents is the accumulated excess collections that Social Security has made over the years. I tell people that the last time we really had a major overhaul of Social Security was back in the 1980s.

Ever since then, we have taken more money in every month in Social Security taxes, FICA, than we have paid out in benefits.

So if you take \$100 in a particular month and only spend \$80, you have \$20 left over. That is the money that goes into the trust fund. It is essentially a savings account.

Now, when people say, oh, it doesn't really exist, you have stolen money from it, and it is not there, that is not true. You can't keep \$20, real paper money, in an account someplace, in a desk. That would be foolish.

What we do is we invest in the only thing the Social Security Administration is allowed to invest in, which is U.S. treasuries. There is actually in excess of \$2 trillion in the trust fund.

The trust fund exists. It is in a drawer in West Virginia in a building named after Senator Byrd, as most of the buildings are in West Virginia. It is full of treasuries.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Actually, General Perry and I were talking about that. You don't mind me calling you that, do you?

Mr. PERRY. Carry on.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Our official military expert. It was helicopters, wasn't it?

Mr. PERRY. Indeed.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We were talking about earlier that my calculations are that, as of right now today, it is a little under \$2.8 trillion of special Treasury notes that have been given from the Treasury to the Social Security trust fund because that cash has been moved over here.

And the revenues that go into Social Security are a combination of the FICA taxes. And would you believe we pay ourselves 3.1 percent interest?

Mr. MULVANEY. Wow.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It took us a while to find that number.

Mr. MULVANEY. Do we actually pay that or we assume that?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. No. No. Technically, we are paying ourselves. So that is part of the revenue into Social Security right now and the Medicare trust fund and all the three big trust funds. We are paying ourselves 3.1 percent, which is actually greater than a 10-year T-bill substantially.

Mr. MULVANEY. That is a great investment right now. Yeah.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. So we are actually paying ourselves a SPIF, and we are still burning through our cash. That is why this board is up, to show you how devastatingly different the number is from just this last August, how fast the numbers have moved.

But even if we go back to 2011, when we were doing these floor presentations, we thought we were talking 2038. You would have been 65-plus for a few years.

Mr. MULVANEY. Could have been at Mr. BUCK's age.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yeah. I am not going there.

Sorry to the Speaker. We don't mean to be teasing you. Well, actually, we do. We are just afraid of it.

But this is really important. So if there is someone out there, whether you are on the right or the left, and you actually care about getting your earned benefits, you need to start demanding your elected officials to take it seriously.

Number one is: What are you going to do to get this economy to grow? Because that becomes the most powerful thing to fix these numbers.

These numbers are rotten and horrible because now we are projecting long-term GDP around 2.2, 2.5. When you start looking at numbers in there, it doesn't work. The math just doesn't work for us.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, there is an ad campaign on television right now that speaks to this. I think it was on during the Super Bowl.

It shows a very dramatic bridge scene and the bridge slowly fades into decay, and it says: This is what will happen to our economy. This is what will happen to our infrastructure because of entitlement spending.

Some folks don't like that term, but we use it here for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and so forth.

It says: Demand of the Presidential candidates what their plan is to solve this problem. Call or write your Member of Congress and demand what their plan is.

I have gotten one call. Have you gotten any?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, it is amazing.

Mr. MULVANEY. How many people have called your office to say: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, what is your plan for fixing this?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I think it is zero. And I have actually had this experience and I think Mr. PERRY, my friend from Pennsylvania, had this experience where we have held budget townhalls and we have held well over a hundred in our district over the last couple years.

We walk through the numbers and then have a discussion about it. I have had an individual go to the microphone and basically use a curse word and then say: I don't care about my grandkids. I want every dime.

Part of the audience laughed. Part of the audience was terrified.

Maybe that was a more interesting discussion when it really was about

your great-grandkids or your grandkids or your kids.

You have to understand that the erosion of these numbers, substantially because of the growth of participation, utilization of the benefits, and the horrible economic growth, is no longer future generations. This is us, particularly you. I didn't realize you were so old.

Mr. MULVANEY. It happens.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Can you see that date on this particular slide? I know you have eagle eyes from flying those helicopters. Our number is 2030, 2031. Right in there the Social Security trust fund is gone.

Mr. MULVANEY. And so what happens on that date?

Mr. PERRY. The only thing you have left to pay is from incoming revenues from taxes. So your benefits are decreased by that whatever that amount is at that time. So it probably fluctuates probably somewhere between 25 and 30 percent.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. In some ways, it is actually more complicated, which I wasn't going to go there, but let's do it for the fun of it.

The Social Security revenues will be subject to the whims of the economy. So you might have 1 month where you are able to pay out more and the next month you are paying out less because of the whims.

You also no longer have the interest revenue. If I handed you \$2.8 trillion today and paid you 3.1 percent, that is what is going into the trust fund today. That is all gone. The interest revenues are gone.

□ 1915

This is a double whammy we are talking about. That is why you never, ever, ever want to get anywhere near these numbers. You fix it long before. Because every day we wait, it gets harder to deal with. Remember, my calculations are that in about 22 months we start to move into principal balance. We start eating our seed corn. And then, every day, the calculations get more difficult.

Mr. MULVANEY. You talked about how every day we wait, it gets harder to do. I remember giving a presentation similar to this at a retirement community in my neighborhood. It was back during one of the first Ryan budgets when we had actually talked about raising the benefit age slowly by a couple of months.

There was a gentleman there who was in his late fifties. He said: Look, I don't want to work another 2 or 3 years. I said: Sir, we are not asking you to do that. He said: What are you asking me? I said: I am asking you to work an extra month. I am asking me to work an extra year. I am asking my triplets to work an extra 2, but I am only asking you to work an extra month. Can't you do that? He said: Of course, I can do that. Will that fix things? I said: That will go a long way towards fixing things.

He got angry that it was that easy and nobody had explained it to him. I said: You are going to get even angrier. If we had done it 20 years ago, it would be a week. If we wait another 20 years, you can never fix it.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You no longer can say 20 years or a couple of decades. It is 14 years now.

I am the proud father of an infant. If you do the calculations, when she reaches her peak earning years, her tax rates will be double what I pay. And that is already done. We have already done that to our children.

You have got to understand the scale of what we have done. Doesn't she have the right to participate in some of the same earned benefits that we should have earned and hopefully will be there because we are going to find a way to fix them?

It is not like the left gets behind television cameras and screams at us or puts up television commercials of a PAUL RYAN look-alike pushing grandma off the cliff. That is political rhetoric. They are basically pulling a scam on you. This is math.

I know we get folks in—I don't you know if you have ever had them at your townhalls—saying: It doesn't feel right. But I don't have a feelings button on my calculator. I have said that over and over to try to make the point that if you want us to protect your retirement future, you have got to demand that we step up and do it. It can be done by a series of little things.

The reality is that Social Security is easy to fix. You can create a little smorgasbord of policy. Some might be aged, some might be folks with certain assets and opting out. There are a whole series of creative things to do. You give some optionality to young people. Because those who now are going to live in sort of the "gig" economy have the ability to put in 50 cents every time they have a transaction or by using the technology of these supercomputers we all carry in our pocket.

Mr. PERRY. Many of your constituents hear, from time to time, whether it is the President, people on the other side—and, frankly, people on our side—say that we are reducing the deficits. They hear this.

If they don't come to your townhall meeting, they say: Well, the deficit is smaller, right? So that is good. What is all this hara-kiri about Social Security and debt. What is all the histrionics?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We are going to get to that in a second, because you have to understand how much the deficit has gone up this year. We have a slide somewhere here that is going to tell us that.

May I ask the Speaker how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The gentleman from Arizona has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Let's actually run through these. Let's use our last 12 minutes and get exactly to your point of where we are at and what has been going on.

I put this one up specially for my friends who had fussed and wailed and complained about this thing called sequestration and how it was the end of the world. Basically, western civilization was going to be collapsed to its knees.

What you see is that the red is sequestration and the green is discretionary spending without sequestration. If you see the blue bars there, that is mandatory spending. That is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the new healthcare law, interest on the debt, and other transfer programs. It explodes off the charts.

If our friends who complained about sequestration so much cared, they would have talked about mandatory spending: the entitlements. But if you look at the differential between that red and green, it is tiny. The fact of the matter is, this year and next year it is actually gone.

Mr. PERRY. I don't think you can completely explain the green part of sequestration. As you can see, it moves above the red line on occasion about 2017.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Basically, let's look at 2016 and 2017. There is no sequestration. We increased our spending. We blew up the sequestration caps this last fall and last year.

Mr. PERRY. We wanted to spend more money.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. So the one thing that was holding us back on discretionary spending is gone, but under the law, it actually comes back in 2018. So that little tiny differential you see on that chart between the red and the green is sequestration.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, would you like to wager a guess as to the likelihood of that reduction staying in law is?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It has got to engage us that if you really cared about the country, you would have the two conversations we are demanding: one, your willingness to change the Tax Code and the regulatory code—the things that help grow the economy—and; two, how are you going to deal with the mandatory spending—the entitlements—that are blowing off the charts?

Mr. PERRY. But the bigger point of this slide, if you will, is that even with sequestration, you can see that, first of all, it is not different from the normal program spending. It has absolutely nothing to do with the huge portion of spending which is mandatory that eclipses everything we do, regardless.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. MULVANEY and I have been having a running conversation about how we put together a budget for this coming year. One of the discussions that we have been trying to calculate is, okay, they blew up some of the spending caps last year. It is what it is. But if they had paid for that increased spending with reforms in entitlements, that is something that goes on and on and on and multiplies out into the future.

Actually, it does a little bit to help our future and save the entitlements. It has sort of a multiplier effect because it lives in perpetuity. It is fascinating, because some of us are trying to pitch that idea of give us a few things that we know actually have a multiplier effect in the future as a way to start to deal with these numbers.

I put this chart up. This is last year. We are going to do this real quickly. I will have it on the Web site, and I will ask both of you if you are willing to do it, too.

You are at your town hall. You have a group walking into your office demanding more money. You have got to understand that happens all day long. Every 15 minutes, there is another meeting of another group that wants more money.

I will get groups that will come in and say: We want more money. If you would just get rid of foreign aid, we will be just fine. Then you pull this board out and say, Okay, you see the little red line there? That is every dime of the State Department's budget. That is military foreign aid, foreign aid to Israel, humanitarian foreign aid, food aid, and all the embassies and their staff, and this and that.

It doesn't do anything. It is great rhetoric. It is a shiny object. It does not do anything, unless you are talking about Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, other welfare programs, ObamaCare, interest on the debt.

Understand that we are incredibly lucky. Interest on the debt this year was supposed to be somewhere in the \$600 billion range. Our projection for the 2016 budget is maybe about \$260 billion. We have been really lucky.

Mr. PERRY. It is the only benefit of a weak economy.

Mr. MULVANEY. It is also the benefit of a totally accommodating Federal Reserve, who sets the price of interest through things like quantitative easing, which is nothing more than printing money. They have unnaturally depressed rates.

Depressed interest rates is nothing more than the cost of money. One of the direct beneficiaries of that has been this body. It has been much easier for us to run of these huge deficits—which is the annual debt—and the overall debt, simply because it is essentially been free money for the last 6 or 7 years.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. MULVANEY, would you agree that the cheap money, the artificial liquidity, has kept Congress from doing what it knew it had to do in reforming the entitlement programs?

Mr. MULVANEY. There is no question. At \$16 trillion of debt, roughly, which is the public debt now, you are talking about interest rates below 2 percent.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. If you really want to get geeky, it is getting shorter because they are going shorter on what they call the weighted daily average.

Mr. MULVANEY. The 40-year rolling average is about 6 percent. That is

what money ordinarily costs the United States of America. It is about 6 percent if you look at it over a generational length of time.

If we simply regress to the mean and end up with money costing us about 6 percent, you are talking about more than \$1 trillion a year in just interest payments.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It is coming.

This goes back to what my friend from Pennsylvania was commenting on. What do we look like in the year we are in right now? Functionally, we are going to be borrowing about \$545 billion this year. This was supposed to be one of the good years. Understand that the inflection doesn't happen until 2018, when the debt starts to explode. This was one of the good years.

Do you understand what \$545 billion is? No one does. That is a lot of zeroes. It is \$1.493 billion a day. It is \$62 million a hour. But, think of this. My favorite one is that it is \$1 million a minute. It is \$17,000 a second. And understand this goes up in 9 years. It basically triples. This triples in 9 years. So, we are borrowing \$17,000 a second, and that number triples in 9 years. I threw these together because I figured we would have a little bit of fun here.

So, we are holding a townhall. We get some of the groups that come in and fuss at us and say: Well, I saw somewhere on some news article that said you should get rid of subsidies for fossil fuels.

First off, it is depreciation, just like every business has, but let's say you took away that depreciation from the production of natural gas and oil. You took it all away.

If we are borrowing, functionally, \$1.5 billion every single day, and you took it all away, it would buy you 12 minutes and 41 seconds of borrowing coverage a day. There are 1,440 minutes in a day, and you just came up with a way to cover 13 minutes. It shows you how fake many of these rhetorical things are that we hear from the political class, particularly the left.

Let's actually take the next step. What about green energy? Did you know green energy has three times the subsidies of fossil fuels?

Let's say you took every dime of the \$36.7 million day that green energy gets. That buys you almost 35 minutes a day. There are 1,440 minutes in a day. We took care of 12 minutes by getting rid of the tax deductions and depreciation for fossil fuels. You got rid of 35 minutes and 24 seconds if you got rid of it all for renewables.

My point is, much of the rhetorical things we hear from the President, from our friends on the left, are completely frauds, mathematically. We have to understand something very, very simple. We are borrowing more than half a trillion dollars this year. In 20 months, the debt starts to explode.

□ 1930

Mr. MULVANEY, when you have actually been in front of some of your audi-

ences in South Carolina, have you ever shown them the chart that this year and next year were supposed to be the good years? It was supposed to be fairly flat, and then it explodes.

Mr. MULVANEY. Actually, I have been showing them that chart since you and I arrived in 2011 because the number has not changed significantly. When you and I arrived and served on the Budget Committee together in 2011, we could have told people roughly what the deficit would have been this year. The projections have not changed.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. And what happened between last August and now that all of a sudden—remember, last year, the deficit was about \$150 billion lower than this, than we are going to run this year. Multiple things happened:

We didn't come close to the economic growth we had built and modeled.

The movement of our citizens into certain programs has been greater than expected, and fewer velocity.

We say unemployment is this, but when we actually look at the actual tax revenues coming from it, there is a disconnect. There is something horribly wrong there. So there is something wrong in economic growth.

And then we blew up many of the sequestration caps last year.

Well, ultimately, we went from, I think we had a \$420 billion, \$430 billion deficit last year, which was still stunning, and now we are going to be \$545 billion.

Look, these are big numbers. It makes your brain hurt. They are uncomfortable. But what you have to appreciate, it is stunning, and it gets dramatically worse in 20 months. We hit what was called the inflection.

I remember reading about this a decade or two decades ago. It is when the baby boom population has been moved in to retirement. And the spiking years are moving in, and they are starting to receive their earned benefits. Then we start adding a couple of hundred billion dollars every year in new borrowing, and it blows off the chart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 757. An Act to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2109. An Act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop an integrated plan to reduce administrative costs under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 11, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4289. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1429; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-246-AD; Amendment 39-18382; AD 2016-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4290. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1045; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-031-AD; Amendment 39-18372; AD 2016-01-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4291. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0447; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-019-AD; Amendment 39-18368; AD 2016-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4292. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2967; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-072-AD; Amendment 39-18376; AD 2016-01-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4293. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1990; Directorate Identifier

2015-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-18364; AD 2016-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4294. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1427; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-203-AD; Amendment 39-18380; AD 2016-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4295. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8695; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-042-AD; Amendment 39-18365; AD 2016-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4296. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0081; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-18371; AD 2016-01-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4297. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1991; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-251-AD; Amendment 39-18381; AD 2016-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4298. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0678; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-207-AD; Amendment 39-18367; AD 2016-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4299. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1984; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-022-AD; Amendment 39-18363; AD 2016-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4300. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8433; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-18366; AD 2016-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4301. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1275; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-070-AD; Amendment 39-18354; AD 2015-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4302. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1981; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-204-AD; Amendment 39-18362; AD 2016-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4303. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4213; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-022-AD; Amendment 39-18359; AD 2016-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4304. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1049; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-18361; AD 2016-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4305. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1422; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-18370; AD 2016-01-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4306. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1990; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-18364; AD 2016-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4307. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1982; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-18353; AD 2015-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4308. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0937; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-18348; AD 2015-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 611. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A, and providing for proceedings during the period from February 15, 2016, through February 22, 2016 (Rept. 114-421). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the maximum penalty for mail theft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4516. A bill to require data brokers to establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of collected personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4517. A bill to provide for greater transparency in and user control over the treatment of data collected by mobile applications and to enhance the security of such data; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the corporate rate of income tax to the OECD average, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4519. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide a five-year extension of the special survivor indemnity allowance provided to widows and widowers of deceased members of the uniformed services affected by required Survivor Benefit Plan annuity

offset for dependency and indemnity compensation received under section 1311(a) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. VELA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KIND, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 4520. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Justin Smith Morrill, United States Senator of the State of Vermont, in recognition of his lasting contributions to higher education opportunity for all Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BERA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DENT, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON

of Connecticut, Mr. LATTI, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEHGAN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BASS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4521. A bill to transfer recreational management authority for Lake Berryessa in the State of California from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MICA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KLINE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 with respect to certain prohibitions regarding the Palestine Liberation Organization under that Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER):

H.R. 4523. A bill to repeal the Military Selective Service Act, and thereby terminate the registration requirements of such Act and eliminate civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and similar local agencies of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 4524. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for mandatory funding, to ensure that the families that have infants and toddlers, have a family income of not more than 200 percent of the applicable Federal poverty guideline, and need child care have access to high-quality infant and toddler child care by the end of fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4525. A bill to make a supplemental appropriation for the Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHUSTER,

Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend the Restore Online Shoppers' Confidence Act to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations and to direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study with respect to online shopping for hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 4527. A bill to temporarily authorize recently retired members of the armed forces to be appointed to certain civil service positions, require the Secretary of Defense to issue certain notifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 4528. A bill to preempt State data security vulnerability mandates and decryption requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4529. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an annual increase in the contribution and benefit base, to exclude a certain number of childcare years from the benefit computation formula, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 4530. A bill to implement integrity measures to strengthen the EB-5 Regional Center Program in order to promote and reform foreign capital investment and job creation in American communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4531. A bill to approve an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Palau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution expressing concern over the disappearance of David Sneddon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 4514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 4515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 4516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 4517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 4518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 4520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec I

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 4522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 4526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, respectively giving Congress the authority to regulate interstate commerce and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers of Congress.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The General Welfare Clause of Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SABLON:

H.R. 4531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 188: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 191: Mr. FLORES and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 267: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 347: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 467: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 662: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 699: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 700: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 745: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 814: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 845: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 863: Mr. REED.

H.R. 921: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 939: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1062: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1142: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1193: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1284: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1391: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1397: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1475: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1552: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1736: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1769: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1887: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2144: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2148: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2228: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2236: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2300: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2330: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2400: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 2411: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2418: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2449: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2515: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2631: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 2680: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2698: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2715: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2737: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2802: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2823: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2992: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. YODER, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3099: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3142: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3180: Mr. REED, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3229: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3283: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3323: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3326: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3355: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 3365: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3381: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 3406: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3516: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3635: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 3706: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3782: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3805: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3880: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3892: Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3913: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3917: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3920: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3947: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3948: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3949: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 3952: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3956: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 3970: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3986: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4007: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 4013: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 4076: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4087: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 4126: Mr. FORBES and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4137: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4144: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4176: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4184: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 4212: Mr. WELCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4219: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 4229: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4235: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4247: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4262: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4263: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4266: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 4281: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4320: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4336: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 4342: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 4344: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 4352: Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 4355: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 4364: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4365: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 4380: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 4400: Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 4420: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 4428: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 4430: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4435: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 4436: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 4438: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 4442: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 4446: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4447: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4461: Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 4470: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 4475: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 4502: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. LATTA and Mr. BUCSHON.
 H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 148: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H. Res. 318: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 454: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H. Res. 548: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 569: Mr. NOLAN.
 H. Res. 571: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H. Res. 582: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H. Res. 588: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BABIN.
 H. Res. 593: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Res. 597: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 610: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

The Manager's amendment to be offered to H.R. 2017, Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act of 2015, by Representative McMorris Rodgers of Washington, or a designee, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.